NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXXI.

AUGUST, 1888.

PROHIBITORY LAW AND PERSONAL LIBERTY.

WHETHER it is right or wrong, *per se*, to buy or sell intoxicating liquors, is a question which loses its interest to me in the face of the acknowledged and appalling evils with which the liquor traffic confronts us. It is not easy to exaggerate these evils, even if this were possible. There is no single channel through which such depths of misery flow over the human race as through this. No ravages of disease, no devastation of nature, no kinds of vice or crime work so much woe as this. Such a statement no intelligent person will be likely to doubt, and no honest one to deny. The liquor traffic is responsible for four-fifths of our poverty, seven-eighths of our crime, and for a proportion of our disease, and vice, and wrong—to say nothing of taxation, which makes every other evil almost insignificant.

Now, it is undoubtedly true that all these evils have a moral source. They root themselves in the choices of a free will. They would all disappear if the moral purpose of every man's life were set upon virtue. And it is equally true that a virtuous purpose must be free. No man is made virtuous by compulsion. His virtue is not put upon him or placed within him, save as he himself originates it in his own choice. I have no dispute, therefore, with one who tells me that law is not sufficient for virtue. I know very well that good laws do not make goodness. Evil remains in the human heart and in society under the best laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But it is a prodigious mistake, therefore, to argue against all constraint of human conduct except by moral means. One ignores the actual facts of human nature who denies the necessity of physical coercion among men. If the infant Hercules could strangle the serpent in his cradle, unnumbered other infants, with a genuine life, would be strangled by the monster unless he were kept from creeping upon them by a power stronger than he. While we would do everything we can to bring men to control their appetites by their own self-mastery, let us not ignore the need, or renounce the privilege, or throw away the power we have of helping them, by all means, to this self-control. In the present condition of the world we may not adjust our laws to the resources of the actual heroes, and forget the requirements of the possible ones.

Most persons, however, admit that men, as they are, cannot be governed without force, and that the liquor traffic needs to be regulated by law. The Western Liquor Dealers and Manufacturers' Protective Association not long ago expressed itself as decidedly convinced of such a need. The question, therefore, relating to the liquor traffic, is not between law and no law, but between one kind of law and another. And, practically, the progress of discussion has narrowed us down to the question, whether we should license the traffic, or prohibit it.

Now, I compare all possible good which may come from the traffic with its actual evils, and the preponderance of the evil is so enormous that any conceivable gain is obliterated by the overwhelming loss. I therefore disregard the gain,—questionable at the best,—and, addressing myself to the enormity of the loss, I would do my utmost to remove it by the destruction of its source. Instead of attempting to restrict, I would prohibit absolutely the traffic, believing that we may thus immediately and greatly lessen the evils, which we hope thus ultimately and wholly to destroy. My reason for such a position—as in this paper I must be brief—may be succinctly stated.

1. A restriction which permits the trade and simply limits the traders to those who are licensed to sell, sets no limit upon the buyer. His opportunity is not diminished. He can get his liquor, if he wishes it, just as copiously as before. One saloon will supply the craving of five hundred—or five thousand, for that matter—as well as many. The evils, therefore, of the traffic are not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessarily reduced by reducing the numbers of those who engage in it. The abolition of places where liquor is sold, rather than their reduction, is what we need, and ought to seek.

2. License, high or low, takes away what ought to be, and, in a healthy community, would be, an important moral restriction, from the seller. It removes from him the condemnation of the community, and justifies him. It makes his act legal. His moral sense, easily blinded by the gigantic profits of his trade, is thus paralyzed. He becomes thus, what we find him to be, obdurate, rapacious, an evil man and seducer, who waxes worse and worse. I do not wish to condemn him, or any man, but I do not know of any trade so demoralizing to the trader—any class of sales which does the seller so much moral mischief—as that in intoxicating drinks. And to this damage the community contributes by licensing him in his trade.

3. To license the liquor traffic on the view that the enormity of its evils can be thus regulated,—impossible, as experience has thus far shown this to be,—to sanction the opening of its floodgates of woe on the pretense that to keep them shut is to infringe upon the liberty which a wise government should ever guard, is not only, as it seems to me, the enslavement of the multitude for the freedom of the few,—an attempt whose result is likely to be the bondage of all,—but it makes the community itself a party to wrong doing. This cannot be done without lowering its own moral tone.

4. The revenue from license falls heaviest where the burden ought to be the least. The cost of the license, while it may add to the price of the liquor sold, does not, so far as I can learn, diminish the amount of the liquor bought and consumed. Practically, the cost of liquor within the limits which any license is likely to put, seems to have little to do with the consumption. An intemperate man is not likely to drink more because it is cheap, nor less because it is dear. The difference between three cents a glass and four makes no appreciable difference with him. But the family of the drunkard! Alas! alas! the great revenues for high license, the enormous taxes on intoxicating drinks are wrung from the wretchedness of worse than widowed wives and worse than orphaned children.

The presence of the prohibitory party in our national politics is in itself a moral education. I hold that the end it seeks is wise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statesmanship and sound ethics, and while I do not anticipate an immediate victory from the use of this weapon, nor an ultimate victory, if we do not employ other weapons also; while I do not believe that Prohibition alone will stop the sale of strong drink any more than it will stop the continuance of gambling, or of theft, or of any other crime, I would make it clear by statute that it is a crime, believing, with Mr. Gladstone, that "it is the duty of Government to make it as hard as possible for a man to go wrong, and as easy as possible for him to go right."

JULIUS H. SEELYE.

IT is evident that the flowing tide is at last with the temperance reform. The solution of the very great and complex problem involved in this reform is next in order; it stands next on the calendar of time. Austin Phelps has said no great social evil has begun to amend ever until it has reached the point of suppuration. The liquor evil has assuredly reached this point, and there is well grounded reason for the belief that the day of amendment is at hand.

Two methods of cure are presented: One, restriction by license, or taxation, made higher and higher; the other, prohibition.

There was a time, back in the twilight of civilization, in almost every country, when stealing was common and little thought of; that theft, in one way or another, was licensed. In France and in Germany still it is thought wise to attempt to control the bawdy-house by license; and, even in parts of this country, the same is true of gambling. The great question in that early age was shall the law be put against stealing; shall theft be made an outlaw at all times and at all places, or shall the privilege of stealing be purchaseable by the few? Then, as now, doubtless, it was argued that "license is restriction"; it is "partial prohibition." But, finally, when theft was made an outlaw—completely, unequivocally so—a mighty step upward was taken. The time will come when to legalize a saloon will be thought as hurtful to social order, as is deemed to-day the legalization of a bawdy-house or a faro-bank; and then an open saloon on a public thoroughfare will be as rare a sight as will be a house of ill-fame or a gambling hell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right here rests the strongest argument for Prohibition: with the masses the most potent educator is the law. With them that which the law permits is right and that which the law forbids is wrong. The law is the great schoolmaster for the masses. We may spin never so fine theories touching license, this will remain true in all of its tremendous educational effect over the minds of the multitude, *The selling, buying and drinking of liquor as a beverage is not wrong, for it is permitted by law.* That was a monstrous wrong done by the New York Legislature two years ago, the enactment of the Ives law, whereby pool-selling was made legal. After the passage of that law, said a prominent pool seller, "I now feel like a gentleman; my business is legal." A saloon-keeper points to his neatly framed "Permit," signed by well-known, respectable citizens, and says, "I am in a legal business and can claim for my protection all that the flag of my country represents." The Nevada Liquor Dealers' Association several years ago passed this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That so long as our business is licensed by the United States, State and County, we consider it perfectly legitimate and honorable, and do not think that we deserve the censure which is constantly being heaped upon us."

In Paris the educational effect of the law on the side of prostitution is horrible beyond thought. According to Von Oettingen's "Moral Statistik" (3d ed. 1882), fifty per cent. nearly of the fifty thousand children born annually in that city are born out of wedlock. A gentleman who, as commissioner, had charge for years of the business of licensing bawdy houses in Paris, tells a story of an old lady whose license he had often renewed. She wrote to him thanking him for his uniform kindness to her, and ended her letter by saying that she was now four-score years and over, and would soon depart for her home beyond the skies, but that her business would be conducted by her granddaughters, and she bespoke for them the same considerate care from his hands that he had shown her, and that she from heaven would bless him. This I quote from a newspaper clipping, and see no reason to doubt its correctness. There was not, seemingly, the slightest suspicion in the mind of that woman that her business was not a proper one. And why should we have expected, pray, to have found such a suspicion? She had complied with the law, and she felt that the law had its mighty arms of protection about her. To the vast majority the law is the one visible, concrete form of right and wrong.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a frightful blunder to place the educative power of the law on the side of a wrong. Let the thunder of the legal code be like that of Sinai, "Thou shalt not." Back yonder, in that distant twilight, Moses might have said, "O Lord, the people are not ready for these prohibitory laws. Public sentiment is not educated sufficiently. They will lie and steal and worship idols. Let us go at the reform gradually. Give them license laws, low license for worshiping a calf; high license for worshiping a full grown cow." No; "thou shalt not" has thundered down the ages, educating all the time up toward its level. It is said that when the Roman emperors fought with the gladiators, leaden swords were used. A license law is a very clumsy sword wielded against the wrong by "the powers that be." It is the duty of government to make the path upward plain as possible and easy as possible, and the way to wrong dark and difficult.

"But," it is objected, "you cannot enforce a prohibitory law." Grant, for argument's sake, that the law cannot be enforced, perfectly enforced. It is still advantageous, exceedingly so, to put the educative power of the law against the evil. An unenforced righteous law is infinitely better than an enforced law that gives half sanction to the wrong. It is never wise to legalize a fragment of a wrong in order to suppress the remainder. In the end the experiment will be found always disastrous.

"But you confound things that are sinful with things that are simply dangerous. We *prohibit* a sin; we *regulate* things that are dangerous. A bawdy-house is wicked; a saloon is dangerous." Again, for argument's sake, grant this distinction. It is not true that we never *prohibit* things that are dangerous. We *prohibit* the building of frame houses inside the fire limits. Why? Not because the building of such a house is sinful, but because it is dangerous. In localities we prohibit absolutely slaughter houses, bone factories, powder mills, etc., solely because these things are dangerous. Prove the saloon to be always a menace to the public welfare, and you have ground sufficient for prohibition. And is it not such a menace? Permit me to quote what I have published elsewhere:

The liquor traffic is a stupendous injury to society and to our Government, and is a portentous and continuous menace to both; responsible, according to Chief Justice Noah Davis,* for eighty per cent. of all crime; according to Premier

* *Homiletic Review*, January, 1885, p. 25.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gladstone, for the infliction of more harm on man "than the three great historic scourges, war, famine and pestilence, combined;" according to the late eminent physician, Dr. Willard Parker,† for 35 per cent. of lunacy, 45 per cent. of idiocy, 75 to 90 per cent. of pauperism, and 10 per cent. of deaths; according to the New York *Tribune*, "this traffic lies at the centre of all political and social mischief, it paralyzes energies in every direction, it neutralizes educational agencies, it silences the voice of religion, it baffles penal reform, it obstructs political reform;" according to Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, so intimately connected is the traffic with crime in England—and the same is certainly true in almost equal degree in America—"If we could make England sober we would shut up nine-tenths of her prisons;" and according to the London *Times*, it is an evil of such vast and growing magnitude "that it may crush and ruin us all."

If a government was ever justified in prohibiting a thing that was dangerous, our government would be justified certainly in prohibiting the liquor traffic. Since this traffic is such a monster evil, what wisdom is there in keeping the tremendous educating power of the law on its side? Whatever else is done or left undone in reference to this traffic, let the business be made an outlaw.

I. K. FUNK.

"PROHIBITION," written with a big "P," is now a term used almost universally in this country to signify the enactment and enforcement of laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in every form to be used as a beverage—the prevention of this commercial transaction by law. There is now an enlarged, the only adequate, and soon to be the universal sense of the term, which includes the manufacture and all other stages, such as transportation, importation from other countries, and any other circumstances which, as well as the sale, are a part of the process which precedes the consumption of such liquors as a beverage.

This form of "Prohibition," when enforced, will prohibit.

When the individual makes his own law and prohibits the consumption of intoxicating liquors to himself he is said to abstain. Prohibition, then, is an external force, and is a denial of personal liberty in the consumption of intoxicating beverages to individuals by the state.

Is it "wise" to do this?

What is wisdom? "The right use or exercise of knowledge; the choice of laudable ends and of the best means to accomplish

† Preface to Richardson's "Ten Lectures on Alcohol," p. 10.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them; the exercise of sound judgment either in avoiding evils or attempting good." Prohibition as a public policy may be considered *first* as to its own nature: whether it be a wise policy under any circumstances; whether, granting its end to be desirable, such an infringment upon the rights of individuals can be justified as a means to secure that end. In this sense it is opposed to the policy of absolute liberty to individuals in the use of alcoholic liquors as beverages.

The true answer to this question must depend upon the fact whether or not such use is an evil, and, if so, how great an evil to society. If its moderate use be such an evil as to seriously threaten the general good, no individual has a right to use it. He has no more right to injure society by injuring himself than by injuring another, and every evil to society which the law of society can reach, society by such law may prohibit.

Here, then, is the main question. I assume that any internal administration which is not medicinal is, "for the purposes of this case," to be taken to be "used as a beverage." It does not follow that the use is not medicinal because no physician prescribes it. But I do assume that science has proven alcohol to be a poison as indisputably as strychnine, and that its administration in any quantity to a perfectly healthy human being in condition not requiring medicine, is poisonous, deleterious to the health of the individual, and consequently being hurtful to that member of society who thus administers it to himself, and, by force of example, to others. Thus, society suffers an evil which society may prohibit, and if the evil be of sufficient magnitude to justify resort to law (for the law avoids those trifles which cost less than the oiling of its own machinery), then society should prohibit and destroy that evil.

On the other hand, the opponents of "Prohibition" declare that the reasonable use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage is not poisonous, that only its excessive use is injurious to the individual, and hence only excessive use is hurtful to society; that there is a use which lies between the medicinal and the excessive, which is not poisonous; and most opponents to Prohibition go further, and say that the individual has complete freedom of use to any degree of merely personal hurt, and that society may not interfere further than to restrain and to punish acts of aggressive injury to others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is as yet a region of conflicting opinion upon facts as well as theory, and the law in any community which is republican in its form of government, will and should depend upon the facts as each community respectively acting as a jury upon the evidence before it shall find them.

From the best examination of the subject which I can make, I am satisfied that the use of alcohol to any extent as a beverage is poisonous, hurtful to the body and mind, almost sure to result in the destruction of the consumer, and full of evil example to others; that the question whether the use be greatly harmful is not to be decided by noting the effect of the first, or it may be the thousandth glass, nor whether here or there may be found a cast-iron stomach and a brain with fibres of steel which can withstand the corrosive action of alcohol for a century; but that the general tendency and final effect of the use as a beverage and the influence of example upon others are the criterion by which the action of society in the election between legal policies is to be decided. And maintaining this view, it is my opinion that the consumption of alcoholic drinks is wrong, because hurtful, both to the individual and to society, and that the law should prohibit not alone the creation and sale of the commodity for use as a mere beverage, but its consumption as such by the individual. It cannot be wrong to make and sell that which it is right to buy and consume. The relation between individuals and the communities which they constitute is not that of hostile bands of marauders separated only by geographical lines across which they continually make reprisals upon each other. The social condition is a plexus of harmonious relations, and no member has a right to do that which, injuring directly himself only, injures the whole body. The old fable of the "Belly and the members" is an authority in point. Certainly the evil of intemperance cannot exist if there be no occasional or so-called moderate drinker. What greater evil is there in society than intemperance? Is theft or arson, or even occasional murder, comparable to it? Therefore I believe that Prohibition should include even the *use* of liquor as a beverage. There is no such thing possible as moderation in the use of poison when not administered medicinally.

These and other considerations satisfy me that prohibition in theory is absolutely right, and whatever is right I believe to be wise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second. But there are degrees in wisdom—wise, wiser, wisest. The question at the beginning has been answered, but I suppose in the public mind the real problem is "What is the *wisest* policy to be pursued in regard to the use of intoxicating drinks?" Assuming that the free individual use is to be restricted by society, how shall it be done?

I still say by absolute Prohibition, because I believe Prohibition to be the wisest method of all, and in fact the only one which can result in the removal of the evil. This is not saying that other policies are foolish. There may be different policies which are wise and other methods wiser still, none of which are the wisest. I only claim that absolute Prohibition is the wisest of all. Prohibition is restraint. Whatever interposes obstacles to the free use is restraint, and therefore beneficial as far as it goes. Hence license laws which permit the sale under conditions of more or less stringency are, so far as they are restrictive, beneficial; therefore they have more or less of wisdom in them, because there is more or less of Prohibition in their practical effect. They are better than nothing. But I must say that I think a small coal of fire about as dangerous in a powder magazine as a large one, and in the long run, and sometimes in the short run, a license law blows up society as badly as free rum.

The theory is that the small coal will go out before the powder ignites; but it doesn't seem to work that way. Perhaps the better simile would be the use of almost water enough to put out the fire, but still leaving the edifice to burn under difficulties. The trouble is that the water gives out and the fire does not. After a while the firemen go home, the reservoir is exhausted, the enemy returns in the form of a new flood of fire, and society becomes again an earthly hell. The dose is too small for the disease. A license law never can stop intemperance, however well enforced. Prohibition can. Agitate, and thus educate, until you create the public opinion with which to enforce it.

In considering this subject, I think we may be instructed by asking ourselves the question, To what end should the efforts of "moral suasion" be directed in dealing with individuals?

Shall we teach total or partial abstinence? Is it not common knowledge that moderate drinking is the highway to the drunkard's grave? Think of a "Temperance Reform" based upon the theory of drinking just enough, but not too much. What an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admirable improvement upon the old pavement of "good intentions" such a boiling concrete as that would be for the hot city!

No, it is proved beyond all cavil that the only safe rule for the individual is total abstinence. Total abstinence is the law which every man, and especially every boy, should lay down unto himself. It is the only law which any considerate parent will desire for his child. Better moderate drinking than ebriety. So murder is worse than arson or theft. But all are bad. Of two evils choose the least. But why choose either, when you have at hand a policy of absolute wisdom? What good is there in a drunken stupor? If there be none, why then go silly over a single glass? It is all poison, and if total abstinence be the wisest policy or law for the individual, why is it not the wisest policy for society to lay down for the good of each and of all, under the sanctions of the law?

The question of enforcement which depends upon the public will, is, of course, important; for without enforcement any policy is void But no law is ever fully enforced. If society were in that state of perfection, the law would no longer be needed.

That would be the millennium "When all crimes shall cease and ancient frauds shall fail." But the better the law in any state of society the more good will be obtained from it, and from a prohibitory law half enforced more than from the most stringent license law enforced to perfection. Besides, Prohibition always holds up before the public mind the loftiest ideal of absolute right in the law. Thus the statute book, like the Bible, becomes an educator, although it may be violated. I am no believer in low, bad laws because there is vice and degradation among men. Lift up the ideals. It is injurious to society to ignore and violate the laws of Nature and of God. The golden rule is none too good law for the savage. God's own laws being perfect are most violated, yet none of them have been repealed on that account. They are not enforced as well as the Maine liquor law, yet the ten commandments are as inflexible as the stone text of the original, and their author issues no license even to those who pay fees into the Treasury of the Temple itself. It will only confirm existing drunken habits and enable the devil to retain his own, for us to adopt his legislation because we are not able fully to enforce any other.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The law of God is always a Prohibitory law. In so far as man's law is not God's law, it is the devil's law.

The law should be perfect even if its execution partially fails. Perfect law will accomplish more than the imperfect law, while there will always be within its scope the complete remedy for all evil, and the consummate standard for aspiration and high endeavor.

HENRY W. BLAIR.

I AM invited, within the limit of fifteen hundred words, to answer the question :

"Is Prohibition a wise policy ?"

Why is all the civilized world moving in some way against the liquor traffic ? The answer is simple : because it is inconsistent with the general good. As it flourishes, every legitimate industry languishes and dies. It disinclines to honest and continuous work all who come under its influence, and finally unfits them for it. There is no interest, public or private, which it does not antagonize. There is no home in the country that does not suffer in some way, directly or indirectly, from its touch, which blasts everything coming within its grasp. It wastes the wages of labor, which ought to go to the homes of the workers; it breaks down the health and shortens the lives of the people, which is a great social misery and a great public disaster. It diminishes and wastes to an extent beyond all power of computation the power of the Nation, physical, moral, financial. It inflicts upon Nation and people more and greater evils than come from all other causes of evil combined. At the same time no good whatever comes from it to the community. The inevitable tendency of the saloon, whatever its name, location, magnitude, or adornments may be, is to drive out from among the people every good thing, and to substitute for it everything bad, and so bad that nothing else in the world is or can be so bad.

All over the English speaking world the people are actively seeking some remedy for this tremendous mischief, and many are the schemes suggested to that end by educated, able and well-meaning men. Let us establish it by law as an honest and useful industry, and perpetuate it through all coming time, some of these people say. Since we cannot suppress it, let us regulate and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

restrict it by "high-license," others say, and when public opinion will sustain such a measure we can prohibit and suppress it. To repress it in any way, say others, is to interfere with personal liberty, and to assume powers not delegated by the people to the government, but which they have reserved to themselves. Now, what is it wise to do about it?

Under no form of license has the liquor traffic ever been "restricted" nor its volume diminished, because under that policy the demand for liquor, whatever it might be, was fully supplied. Many intelligent people have a horror of what they call "free rum." What is the worst that can possibly come from that? This, and nothing more: That the demand for liquor will be fully supplied; and the same thing will happen under any system of license, however carefully the law may be drawn. No one who has any knowledge of this matter, either personal or from books, can be ignorant of the fact that the liquor traffic licensed is practically "free rum." There is no other country in the world where the policy of license has been more firmly established, or where the laws relating to it have been so carefully studied and elaborated as in England. At every session of Parliament there are bills brought in with a view to the changing in some way the law of license, under which the country has become one of the most drunken nations in the world, the condition of a large proportion of the working population there having become as the result of this policy almost unendurable.

Looking the ground all over carefully, we "fanatical" temperance men and women have come to the conclusion, unanimously and irrevocably, that under no circumstances nor for any consideration will we consent to any policy giving legal status to the saloon. So far as our voice and vote are concerned, it shall have no standing under the law, but shall be put under its ban. If we cannot have it forbidden and suppressed we will not consent that it shall have legal permission or protection. Whatever evil to society may come from it, let it be without sanction of the State.

It seems to follow from all this that we are quite ready to declare prohibition to be a wise policy; that it is the only wise policy; and that no other has even a suspicion of wisdom in it. I do not forget that many able men affirm that prohibition has been a failure everywhere and must always continue to be so, and that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is a folly to persist in a policy which practically has come to nothing. People who talk in that way have no knowledge of the matter of which they speak, and this is the only question, I think, upon which such men would venture an opinion without first knowing something about it.

Prohibition has failed nowhere that it has ever been adopted; that is, everywhere it has diminished the volume of the liquor traffic, and from large areas of country it has driven out entirely drinking houses and tippling shops. These results of prohibition have been widely printed and published a thousand times all over the English speaking world, and it is not a credit to any intelligent man that he is ignorant of a matter which more deeply than any other touches the highest interests of nations and peoples. This being so, then how is it, objectors may inquire, that in Maine and in many other districts, where prohibition exists, the liquor traffic yet lingers on a scale larger or smaller, and more or less on the sly, especially in the cities and large towns ?

The answer is simple and ready. Liquor is sold in violation of law, not for the fun of it, but for the profit. There has never yet been constructed any prohibitory law with reference to this fact and to meet this point, to wit : To make it unprofitable and exceedingly uncomfortable to those who persist in violating it. The able men to whom I have alluded, who object to prohibition as impracticable, seem to assume that any law which simply forbids the liquor traffic is in fact "prohibitory," irrespective of the character and quality of its machinery. The steam engine, the ocean steamer, the steam printing press, are a great success, and this is due only to the fact that their machinery is constructed and its several parts carefully and skillfully arranged with reference to the work which they have to perform. Everybody not quite an innocent can easily see this. Very well, then, Why have not the Prohibitionists arranged their laws with reference to this want ? The innocents ask this question, and coming from them, it is a proper one and should be answered.

When the Maine Law was constructed it was supposed that public opinion might not approve such penalties as would fully meet the necessities of the case, and they were therefore made moderate to avoid that danger. All other prohibitory laws have been more or less modeled on that pattern. But all our experience in the enforcement of these laws has emphasized the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact, that they are imperfect in having insufficient penalties, and in permitting such discretion to the courts that in many localities the law is practically nullified. Why then, the innocent may properly inquire, do we not have these imperfections corrected and these wants supplied?

The politics of the country, in nation, states, and cities, is now a mere scramble for office and its rewards, with no reference whatever to the public welfare. The liquor traffic is a tremendous power, from its magnitude, its wealth, its large vote, which is a unit, employed only in its own interest, and from its ability to corrupt voters with its money and party leaders by its ballots. From this it happens that now, so far as its interests are concerned, it controls absolutely the legislation of the nation and of the states and cities; so we find it difficult everywhere, and in Maine impossible, for the moment, to obtain such legislation as we require for the extermination of the fraction of the liquor traffic yet remaining. This traffic now notoriously controls the politics of the country. In the near future two great parties will be openly and squarely divided upon the question—Rum or No Rum? and the battle will be fought out at the ballot-box on that line. All other questions of public policy of whatever kind are insignificant when compared with this.

Protection to the labor of the country from foreign competition, so that our people may have larger wages, looks only to this point, that our homes may be peaceful, prosperous, thrifty, happy, from a larger expenditure upon the necessaries, comforts and refinements of life. The suppression of the liquor traffic, which politicians resist, would insure all this beyond the wildest dreams of the warmest imagination, since it would involve a saving to our firesides of more than fifteen hundred million dollars annually—a sum so vast as to be incomprehensible—now spent, lost, far worse than wasted in drink.

NEAL DOW.

IF, in this question, we mean by prohibition, prohibition in its most effective form, then is it most assuredly a wise policy. The restraining sentiment and law must cover a sufficient territory to give the conditions of independent action, and be so sustained by those who, as public officers, embody the power of the people as to bring that power fully, readily and constantly to bear in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accomplishment of its purpose. We are glad to make an appeal to reason on the question. If sound reason does not support Prohibition as a national policy, the discovery of that fact would bring instant relief from wearing and unrewarded labor; if it does justify Prohibition, we shall appeal the more hopefully to our fellow citizens to support the measure.

If we consider the slightness of the pleasures that attend on strictly temperate use of intoxicating drinks, the temptations which accompany it, the ease with which this indulgence passes into excess, the obscurity of the transition, the many disturbances and diseases which more careful investigation is tracing to habits of drink which have hitherto been regarded as strictly moderate, we believe that entire abstinence is the safest, most convenient, most commanding and most pleasurable personal attitude. We lose almost nothing by it, and gain at once an impregnable position. Even though we hesitate at this point of personal safety and pleasure, if we regard the community as a whole, with its weakness of will, its excessive appetites, its greediness of excitement, its readiness in assuming a ground of factious and foolish independence, its slowness in seeing danger, its disastrous inheritance of vice both from physical and moral transmission, we cannot doubt that entire abstinence alone furnishes the conditions of universal safety. We have no ground for a temperate use of intoxicating drinks in the community, till the physical balance of the general constitution is restored by long disuse, and greatly strengthened by moral force. We are as a patient who has already fallen into the hands of the physician, and with whom the injunction of abstinence is peremptory.

If this conclusion is correct, if wine has often made, and is sure to make, my brother to offend, then, in obedience to the sympathetic desire to render aid where aid is needed, I cannot do otherwise than accept in my own action the common law of safety. Not to do this is to set up my own pleasures against the well-being of the community, is to isolate my life to its own injury and the injury of all. The well-being involved in this self-denial is so extended, so urgent, that hesitancy to accept its mandate stands out as as flagrant self-assertion.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the imperative motives to this self-denial. Philanthropy has been urging them for the last half century. They are wide and deep, yet crop out conspicuously on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the surface of things. The latest enumeration lies before me: "60,000 lives annually; hundreds of thousands of wretched homes; the darkened future of millions of children; 35 per cent., according to Dr. Willard Parker, of all idiots, 45 per cent. of the insane, 90 per cent., according to Judge Noah Davis, of all paupers, and 80 per cent. of crime."

It matters not whether these estimates are entirely correct. It matters not whether the money expended directly in the purchase of intoxicating drinks by this nation is a little less or a little more than $900,000,000 annually. These statements will bear large reduction, and the motives to action remain unaltered. The desire for human happiness, the labor for collective progress, the willingness to do and to suffer for righteousness, gather with overwhelming force in this one effort to defeat the avarice and appetite that are setting at naught the general welfare.

Nor are there any new purposes or strange methods called for in working out this social problem by the collective power of the state. The interests involved are those most pertinent to law. Thousands of households, tens of thousands of women and children—those who in their weakness most of all appeal to civil law for protection—call with the pressing entreaty of utter want for the shelter the state is failing to provide them. These helpless ones are left to the most bitter and irremediable wrongs that human nature suffers. And has the state no function, the community no duty, in giving the conditions of safety to those, from the nature of the case, so utterly dependent? Crime, pauperism, burdensome taxation, the waste of physical powers and the overthrow of moral ones, are all wrapped up in the meshes of this traffic in intoxicating drinks? Can we not cut asunder, if we will, this net of vice, and let the unobstructed beneficence of Nature have way? Narrow aims and comprehensive ones, small motives and large ones, alike urge society to protect itself, and to define for itself its own conditions of prosperity.

The fact that this problem involves the most profound moral issues ought not to embarrass us in invoking the aid of the law in doing those things for which law is instituted. It is said that moral power must lie back of and sustain this movement. Certainly; but prohibitory law is the most direct and pertinent expression of that moral power. Moral energy can no more exist without law than law without moral energy. The law does what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral manhood proposes. Prohibitory law is to express—we are laboring for this very end—the deep, unalterable conviction of the majority of the nation. The sentiment opposed to it will lack almost wholly moral force. It will be made up of the passions of those deeply immersed in intemperance, of the sentiments of those engaged in this cruel traffic, of the feelings of those who seek their own pleasure with no careful submission of it to the claims of others, and of the convictions of that very small number who reason negligently on the duties to their fellow citizens involved in this problem. The law cannot come into being without overwhelming moral energy in its favor, neither can it continue in being without daily adding to the health and vigor of the public mind.

There is no new principle involved in the law, no unusual trespass on personal liberty. It is a gross caricature to say that Prohibition seeks to regulate what a man shall eat and drink, and to control actions which lie within the range of his personal wisdom and pleasure. It seeks no such thing. It seeks to protect the industrious against the waste of the dissipated; the innocent against the crimes of the guilty; the home against the merciless hands that destroy it; and generations unborn from the inheritance of weakness, poverty and vice which is ready to overwhelm them. If in attaining this urgent object of civil society, the pleasure-seeker is deprived of a portion of his liberty, we can only say that it is a regretable incident of not much moment in a great and progressive movement. If a man builds a house in a city, he must build, not according to his own fancy, but in a method consistent with the security of other houses. If he drives a horse in crowded streets, he must drive so as to consult the safety of those about him. In managing his own household, he must be held subject to the direction of the board of health. Not to pass and enforce prohibitory laws when they are called for would be to disregard the fundamental principle on which civil government rests—the priority of the interests of all over the interests of any one man. To regard prohibitory law as a wanton invasion of individual liberty is, if we estimate aright the losses—searching, comprehensive, and inevitable—of intemperance, and the gains of indulgence—trifling, willful, and personal—anarchical, as much so as any opinion well can be. If a man will not yield the waywardness of a dangerous appetite for the public weal, what will he concede? If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the public—the public that conscripts its citizens for purposes of war—cannot defend its safety, and provide for its progress at such a point as this, what, pray, can it do? It never lays a restriction on its citizens without some limitation of this so-called liberty, this illusion of an untempered spirit.

But the wisdom of this policy of prohibition must turn on one thing farther, the possibilty of success. We are to remember that we are not speaking of the possibilities of prohibition in a community, the majority of which are opposed to it, but of those possibilities when the majority heartily approve it. In discussing the wisdom of the policy, we have to consider, not the labor of securing the law, but the efficiency of the law when it is obtained. The difficulty of enforcing this form of law arises from two things: a strong appetite on the one side, and a favorable opportunity to make money on the other. We cannot exterminate the appetite except by slow degrees. We can almost at once remove the money motive to pander to it. The appetite does not furnish the means of gratification, except as it appeals to avarice. Let the state and general government unite in an effort to exterminate the traffic, and the traffic would yield rapidly to the pressure.

The manufacture, to meet the demand, must be on a large scale, and cannot hide its operations. Transactions of this kind that are concealed are relatively insignificant. Capital, timid, conservative, loving respectability, at every step dependent on law, will not in any large amounts engage in illicit production.

The inducements to such production, under the Treasury tax imposed for years by the general government, have been very great. But the moment the nation resolved to control the business, the effort was thoroughly successful. This is a conflict whose danger lies in timidity.

Once overcome fear, and open the attack, and the enemy is easily scattered. Nothing is more weak than debased appetite; nothing is more fearful of assault than outlawed capital.

It is said that these laws are incapable of enforcement in large cities. If large cities were not rapidly running to economic waste, social anarchy, and lawless corruption, we might attach more weight to this assertion. The growing evils of our cities are most directly associated with this traffic. If it is more difficult to suppress the trade in these communities, it is in the same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

degree more needful. If the city is to be redeemed at all, if its anti-social and anti-republican tendencies are not to go on to complete themselves in overthrow, the most direct and ready step toward that redemption is the repression of the saloon.

Dry up the streams of intoxicants that flow into our cities, and appetite will no more create beer and whiskey than thirst furnishes water, or than hunger supplies food. The weakness in our way is almost wholly a moral one, and does not make against the wisdom of the policy of prohibition. That policy grounds itself in renewed moral strength, and for that very reason is a wise policy. It certainly is not wise to set up one social standard in the city and another in the country; to let vice and anarchy rule in squatter sovereignty wherever they can win a foot of territory. Let us stand by the nation in its legitimate purposes, in its conjoint strength. National life is the comprehensive condition of all life. Prohibition has already shown its nationalizing power by the enthusiasm with which it is gathering all sections and all classes into one patriotic effort.

JOHN BASCOM.

POLICY is defined by Webster as "that system of measures which the sovereign of a country adopts and pursues, as the best adapted to the interests of the nation."

Here, the sovereign is the people; for, as Lincoln said: "This is a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Hence the question of prohibition addresses itself to the interests of the ruling power in our state and nation. Is it for the interests of the people that all public crimes shall be suppressed? To ask the question is to answer it; for every crime is opposed to the best interests of the people, and is a direct injury inflicted on them.

Civil liberty brings protection to the people, by prohibiting all acts and practices injurious to them. Prohibition of crime is civil liberty. License of crime is despotism in its worst form. When we permit any crime to rise and rule in this Republic, we enthrone a traitor for the sure and swift destruction of free government.

Prohibition is wise because it is the only form of legislation adapted to the suppression of crimes. That the manufacture,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sale, and supply of alcoholic poison, in its many beverage forms, is a moral crime, few will contend in the negative, whose minds are not clouded by personal participation in the evil, under the light of our advanced civilization. That it is a source of vast injury to the people, even its authors admit, and all its countless victims attest, by their own revelations of human depravity, wretchedness and woe, too terrible to paint or tell. Since the beginning of the present century the alcohol crime has taken the lives of more of more than four millions of our people; has destroyed more than forty thousand millions of dollars of the fruits of national industry; and has multiplied vice, crime, insanity, poverty, ignorance, disease, degradation and misery, in all forms and places, beyond all power of computation. Science fails in the awful inquest, and official statistics seem incredible. The records of courts and the reports of jails and prisons, with one voice, have, through all the investigations of this century, proclaimed it as the prolific parent of more than four-fifths of all the crimes that have cursed society; and the echoes of the world have repeated the same lesson. Can we impeach this universal testimony? Can we doubt this judgment of all experience and history in our own and other nations?

This being the nature of the evil, so proved and confessed as the most colossal, cruel and destructive of all crimes, the law applied must be adapted to that nature, or it will only serve to augment its malign power, by the impotence of the aggression. Every triumph of wrong adds to its force for evil. The legislator who would propose the forms of limited permission, license, taxation, local option, personal restriction, or other kind of regulation for the pronounced public crimes, or any of them, from murder down to petit larceny, would be met with universal derision. Why? Because public intelligence everywhere sees and teaches that there is but one form of law adapted to a crime, and that is total, unconditional prohibition.

If the offspring of the alcohol crime can only be suppressed by prohibition, how can the mighty parent crime be subdued by any other kind of legislation?

Prohibition is wise because it is morally right. If total abstinence as a moral and social principle is the right, and the only right ground of the temperance reform, as now universally affirmed by the friends of that reform, then total prohibition as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a legislative principle is not only right, but is a high and commanding duty. Total abstinence and prohibition, the one a voluntary and the other a coercive remedy for the evils of the alcohol traffic, are both founded on the broad reason and admitted fact, that those evils are the inherent and vital elements, as well as the inevitable results of that traffic; and hence, the only effective remedy is not reform, but annihilation, of the common and corrupt cause of them all.

Temperance societies are now all radical. They strike at the root of the manufacture, traffic and use of alcoholic beverages. The only associations which in this day pretend to advocate the principle of moderate drinking as a preventive of intemperance, are the leagues and conventions of liquor dealers. The experience of millions and the experiments of centuries testify to its terrible absurdity.

On the same plane of truth, legislation against all kinds of vice, immorality and crime must be radical, or it is not only useless, but it is false and fearfully mischievous. The alcohol traffic is either right or wrong. If right, it should be free, for in this land of freedom there should be no chains imposed on art, labor or commerce outside of prison walls. If it is an organic wrong, that wrongs the people, it should die, and all laws that pretend to regulate, to sanctify and to save it are treason against God and the nation. This is a high question of truth and right which can be solved by no compromise. Policy may divide a principle with the devil or a demagogue, but not with God, not with the conscience of an honest man.

Prohibition is wise, because it is the highest practice of wisdom for government, as well as men, to do right, and it is their lowest act of folly to do wrong.

By a law fundamental and functional to all civil government, every act of the people under its administration, not prohibited by it, is sanctioned, either by its express or implied license. Its silence gives license by permission. The eminent Ohio jurist, Judge Ranney, rendering the decision of the Supreme Court in *Railroad Co.* vs. *Keary* (3 O. S. Rep., 205), said: "*Whatever is not prohibited may be lawfully done.*"

Having the power to suppress the alcohol crime, government assumes the responsibility of its existence, and every voter, as an integral part of the government, bears his part of the guilty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burden. As Fox said in the British Parliament of the slave trade:

"Government must either abolish it, or plead guilty of all the wickedness which has been shown to attend it. It could not be regulated, because there could be no regulation of robbery and murder." Thus to license, regulate, tax, or in silence to permit the existence of the far greater alcohol crime, is to involve government and people in its perpetuation, as the aiders and abettors of its wrongs and authors of its miseries. When the law-making power refuses to prohibit a wrong business, it bestows on it the same silent license that it does on the honest industry of the farmer and mechanic. It clothes that wrong with its most powerful sanction and exalts it to an eminence with the most honored and esteemed of the arts, trades, and avocations. It is by force of the implied more than the express sanctions of government that the alcohol crime has built up its causeway of human guilt and wretchedness over the broad highway of religion and laws.

Prohibition is a wise policy because it is the only successful one ever pursued by civilized governments for the suppression of crimes. Whether in a military despotism or in a free republic, prohibition always prohibits the criminal customs of society when backed by rulers ready and willing to enforce it. None are more prompt than the criminals themselves to recognize the fact when they see that the government is in earnest against them.

Formerly dueling was a fashionable custom in many civilized countries, and it yet lingers in some of them, where the laws respecting it are weak and not respected by the rulers themselves. When this custom had become alarmingly prevalent in the Swedish army, the King resolved to put an end to it. Hearing that two of his officers were about to engage in a duel, he ordered that it should be fought in his presence. The parties at first felt greatly pleased at the compliment, but on arriving at the place they were surprised and dismayed to find not only the King with his principal officers there, but a gibbet standing. On inquiring the meaning of the latter, they were informed that it was to hang them both on when the duel was over, the victor by the neck and the vanquished by the heels. They were not slow in discovering that there had been a mutual misunderstanding between them, which was satisfactorily explained. They shook hands, and that was the end of dueling in the Swedish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army. The same evil was promptly suppressed in several of our States by laws which classed it with murder. In Ohio, the constitution forever disqualifies from office every person who fights a duel, sends, accepts, or knowingly carries a challenge for it; and the Legislature added the penalty of imprisonment up to ten years in the penitentiary for either of these acts.

So of lotteries, yet licensed, taxed and regulated in too many Christian states and nations. The Ohio constitution prohibits, and the law punishes with heavy fines and imprisonment all who prepare, publish, or in any way promote lotteries and schemes of chance.

Nobody doubts that prohibition prohibits dueling and lotteries in Ohio. Thus it will soon be with the alcohol crime. Like the enchanted bottle of the Arabian tale, when sealed up with the seal of Solomon and cast into the sea, its power is destroyed; but if recovered and unsealed, though under the most rigid guard, the pestilential mist will, in a moment, go out of it and tower as a malignant giant in the heavens. That fable of the Orient has in it the true philosophy of law against crime. That seal of Solomon the wise is the wise policy of Prohibition.

G. F. STEWART.

THE question submitted to me is this: "Is Prohibition a wise policy?" I assume that this refers to the enactments of laws by Congress and the legislatures of the several States prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages, and shall so answer.

Behind that question, which is specific, lies the more general question, whether the State acts wisely in prohibiting, for any reason, the manufacture and sale of anything by which a citizen can make money. That question does not require long discussion. The *right* to do such a thing has always been assumed, and has lately been settled by the law courts of this country. The *wisdom* of the special prohibition has always been supposed to depend upon the nature of the article prohibited, and its effect on the general welfare. It might surprise some people to learn what a long catalogue of prohibited things stands on our statute books.

The sound principle that no citizen shall be deprived of life or liberty or property without due process of law, has long been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the constitution of nearly every State in the Union, and was there when the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was adopted, making that principle a part of the supreme organic law of the land. But never, in the language of the Supreme Court (October Term, 1887), "has it been regarded as incompatible with the principle, *equally vital* because essential to the peace and safety of society, that all property in this country is held under the implied obligation that the owner's use of it shall not be injurious to the community."

In the same case the court held that a State may even prohibit the sale of a dangerous commodity, though patented by the General Government. It illustrates this principle by a case. The State of Kentucky enacted a statute in 1874, imposing a penalty on any one offering for sale or selling any oils or fluids that would burn or ignite at 130 degrees Fahrenheit. One of the citizens having sold within the commonwealth a certain oil for which letters patent had been issued in 1867, but which did not come up to the standard of the statute, was indicted therefor. He disputed the State's authority to prevent or obstruct the exercise of the right which he claimed under the patent, but the courts upheld the State.

In the same opinion the Supreme Court cites another case decided after the adoption of the fourteenth amendment. The village of Hyde Park, Ill., in the same county with Chicago, under legislative authority passed an ordinance forbidding the transportation through the village of any offensive and unwholesome matter. A fertilizing company located its works in that particular part of the county. This was done at great expense and under the authority of its charter. In addition the charter of the village provided that it should not interfere with the transportation of animal matter from Chicago or from manufacturing it into a fertilizer. The enforcement of the village ordinance would destroy the business and seriously impair the value of the company's property. Nevertheless when the business became a nuisance the court maintained the authority of the village ordinance.

These cases show the lawfulness of prohibition, but still leave the question of the wisdom open. To settle that we are to consider the character of the thing prohibited and the probable effects of prohibition. By the rum traffic let us understand the making and selling of intoxicant beverages. In itself that, or any other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business, may be lawful to-day and criminal to-morrow. The State cannot part with its discretion "any more than with the power itself," says the Supreme Court. To-morrow it may declare any business criminal, and from the moment of the passage of the act that business becomes criminal. The aim of Prohibitionists is to render the manufacture and sale of intoxicant beverages criminal. There seems no other way of abating this nuisance.

Any mode of licensing or taxing keeps the business lawful. The keeper of the worst groggery in New York, who sells under license, is pursuing as *lawful* a business as the editor and publisher of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. In a court in this city I was present when a clergyman was confronted by a lawyer with the statement that his client was engaged in a business as lawful as the clergyman's. And the lawyer told the truth.

Now, is it *wise* to make the rum traffic criminal?

It will be granted that it is always wise to do that which will greatly advance the welfare of the community, or greatly relieve it of any nuisance, to help us in settling the question of prohibiting its continuance. Let us inquire what would be the effect if the rum traffic were abolished.

In the first place, there are *six hundred millions* of dollars at least gathered in by the liquor dealers in the United States for intoxicant beverages. Much of this goes out of the country, but probably the larger portion remains. If it all remained the country would be financially no poorer. There would be a readjustment of possession without diminution of bulk. We spend *five hundred millions* for breadstuffs. If the drink produced the good effects of the bread there would be nothing to say. But let us compare the two. If not a single drop of the beverage had been taken last year the whole community would be at least as well off; but if not a crumb of bread had been eaten probably the whole community would have perished. If any had survived they would scarcely have been able to discharge the ordinary duties of life.

That is the very mildest way of putting it; we all know how much stronger the case is. The result of the spending of those six hundred millions of dollars was the causing of the death of more people than all other causes combined. The country lost a host of men who might be working in mines and factories, who might be engaged in a thousand productive arts. Each dollar spent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in intoxicant beverages represents a dollar lost from the wealth of the country, in the sense that the dollar failed to be added to the general wealth. And every one knows that that is a very small part of the pecuniary loss. There were *seven hundred thousands* of drinking men who did not die, but who "lost" whole months of time by the inability and the diminution of ability wrought in them by the drink. If each lost six days only in the whole year, it would aggregate the loss of the labor of a thousand men for thirteen years. The question of the tariff is insignificant when compared with the question of the rum traffic, if this question be regarded only in a financial light.

This appears more clearly if we take into account the army of about 400,000 men who are engaged in the manufacture, transportation, and sale of intoxicants. These are grown, able bodied men. They are removed from all the profitable pursuits of human beings. They are engaged in a business which adds nothing to the bodily, intellectual, or spiritual, advancement of a single human being. The world would have been no worse, the country no poorer, if every man of them had been buried on the first of January of the preceding year. Is there any other business in which these hundred of thousands of men could have been engaged which would not have added, at least, one dollar to the general wealth of the country? But that great body of workers did not enhance the property of the country by the amount of one solitary dime! Their business was such that they could not.

It is a wicked business, even where it is lawful. This is shown by the fact that none but the lower class of men can engage in it. Search the grogshops of New York, and see if you will find a single respectable Israelite engaged as a saloonist. His religion would forbid. Is there a Protestant church in the city that would permit a grogseller to remain in its membership? Would public opinion outside the church tolerate such a communion? Is that a proper business to be allowed to exist, a business in which no Mohammedan, Jew, or Christian can engage in without violating the sanctions of his religion?

To say nothing of the *thirty-three millions of dollars* worth of grain destroyed as food—thus enhancing the cost of breadstuffs, and made into poison—thus multiplying the number of unproducing consumers; it is estimated that the rum traffic throws upon the community the expenditure of over *one hundred and*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ninety millions of dollars annually for the following items: medical attendance and medicines used in sickness caused by drink; loss to employers, by drunken workmen; support of the insane, the paupers and the criminals made by the traffic; the loss of the labor of the paupers, and the cost of judicial proceedings, all caused by drink.

If all this were brought about by unorganized traffic it would be the most frightful nuisance known to mankind since the world began; but in this country the liquor dealers organize to resist the laws, and to aid, abet and sustain one another therein. They go beyond that and attempt to control legislation, in which they generally succeed; and to control political conventions, in which they have always succeeded until the Prohibition party held a convention. Is anything better known than that we have in New York only such civil officers as the rum traffic allows? Has there been a nomination made by a Democratic or Republican convention in twenty-five years without consulting the liquor dealers? When a question exceeds in its financial importance all other questions before the people, all tariff, civil reforms and other questions, involving more interests of every kind to more citizens than all other political questions that have ever been agitated, and the most elaborate consideration is given to the smaller questions by two such great bodies as met in the conventions this year in St. Louis and Chicago, what does it mean? The conventions were afraid of the liquor dealers; that's the only possible explanation. In the latter convention good men, such as Mr. Albert Griffin, wanted an anti-saloon plank put in the platform. Tens of thousands of Republicans desired it; but it was known that if that plank were omitted, those good men would remain in the party, but the committee were given to understand distinctly that if anything of the kind were inserted, the liquor dealers would desert and carry off their followers; and the committee and the convention succumbed.

There exists, then, a business in this country which can be carried on only by men whose moral character is at least so low that they cannot be expected to obey the law; a business which injures the country more than the most stringent prohibition of imports, or the most unrestricted free trade could; a business which produces more distress, destroys more property, happiness, and life, than all other things known; a business which injures the country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every year more than our civil war did in four years; a business that produces four-fifths of all the robberies, thefts, murders, and other crimes in the land; a business which does the nation and the world more harm than war, famine, and pestilence combined; a business which stands against all material, intellectual and spiritual progress.

I am asked whether the policy of making that business criminal is wise? Most assuredly, yes. If that be not true, where is the wisdom of prohibiting anything?

CHARLES F. DEEMS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DIVIDED HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH.

"Let determined things to destiny hold unbewailed their way."

THERE is a continual effort in the mind of man to find the harmony that he knows must exist between all known facts. It is hard for the scientist to implicitly believe anything that he suspects to be inconsistent with a known fact. He feels that every fact is a key to many mysteries—that every fact is a detective, not only, but a perpetual witness. He knows that a fact has a countless number of sides, and that all these sides will match all other facts, and he also suspects that to understand one fact perfectly—like the fact of the attraction of gravitation—would involve a knowledge of the universe.

It requires not only candor, but courage, to accept a fact. When a new fact is found it is generally denied, resisted, and calumniated by the conservatives until denial becomes absurd, and then they accept it with the statement that they always supposed it was true.

The old is the ignorant enemy of the new. The old has pedigree and respectability; it is filled with the spirit of caste; it is associated with great events, and with great names; it is intrenched; it has an income—it represents property. Besides, it has parasites, and the parasites always defend themselves.

Long ago frightened wretches who had by tyranny or piracy amassed great fortunes, were induced in the moment of death to compromise with God and to let their money fall from their stiffening hands into the greedy palms of priests. In this way many theological seminaries were endowed, and in this way prejudices, mistakes, absurdities, known as religious truths, have been perpetuated. In this way the dead hypocrites have propagated and supported their kind.

Most religions—no matter how honestly they originated—have been established by brute force. Kings and nobles have used

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them as a means to enslave, to degrade and rob. The priest, consciously and unconsciously, has been the betrayer of his followers.

Near Chicago there is an ox that betrays his fellows. Cattle —twenty or thirty at a time—are driven to the place of slaughter. This ox leads the way—the others follow. When the place is reached, this Bishop Dupanloup turns and goes back for other victims.

This is the worst side: There is a better.

Honest men, believing that they have found the whole truth—the real and only faith—filled with enthusiasm, give all for the purpose of propagating the "divine creed." They found colleges and universities, and in perfect pious, ignorant, sincerity provide that the creed, and nothing but the creed, must be taught, and that if any professor teaches anything contrary to that, he must be instantly dismissed—that is to say, the children must be beaten with the bones of the dead.

These good religious souls erect guide-boards with a provision to the effect that the guide-boards must remain, whether the roads are changed or not, and with the further provision that the professors who keep and repair the guide-boards must always insist that the roads have not been changed.

There is still another side.

Professors do not wish to lose their salaries. They love their families and have some regard for themselves. There is a compromise between their bread and their brain. On pay-day they believe—at other times they have their doubts. They settle with their own consciences by giving old words new meanings. They take refuge in allegory, hide behind parables, and barricade themselves with oriental imagery. They give to the most frightful passages a spiritual meaning—and while they teach the old creed to their followers, they speak a new philosophy to their equals.

There is still another side.

A vast number of clergymen and laymen are perfectly satisfied. They have no doubts. They believe as their fathers and mothers did. The "scheme of salvation" suits them because they are satisfied that they are embraced within its terms. They give themselves no trouble. They believe because they do not understand. They have no doubts because they do not think. They regard doubt as a thorn in the pillow of orthodox slumber. Their souls are asleep, and they hate only those who disturb their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreams. These people keep their creeds for future use. They intend to have them ready at the moment of dissolution. They sustain about the same relation to daily life that the small boats carried by steamers do to ordinary navigation—they are for the moment of shipwreck. Creeds, like life-preservers, are to be used in disaster.

We must also remember that everything in nature—bad as well as good—has the instinct of self-preservation. All lies go armed, and all mistakes carry concealed weapons. Driven to the last corner, even non-resistance appeals to the dagger.

Vast interests—political, social, artistic, and individual—are interwoven with all creeds. Thousands of millions of dollars have been invested; many millions of people obtain their bread by the propagation and support of certain religious doctrines, and many millions have been educated for that purpose and for that alone. Nothing is more natural than that they should defend themselves,—that they should cling to a creed that gives them roof and raiment.

Only a few years ago Christianity was a complete system. It included and accounted for all phenomena; it was a philosophy satisfactory to the ignorant world; it had an astronomy and geology of its own; it answered all questions with the same readiness and the same inaccuracy; it had within its sacred volumes the history of the past, and the prophecies of all the future; it pretended to know all that was, is, or ever will be necessary for the well-being of the human race, here and hereafter.

When a religion has been founded, the founder admitted the truth of everything that was generally believed that did not interfere with his system. Imposture always has a definite end in view, and for the sake of the accomplishment of that end, it will admit the truth of anything and everything that does not endanger its success.

The writers of all sacred books—the inspired prophets—had no reason for disagreeing with the common people about the origin of things, the creation of the world, the rising and setting of the sun, and the uses of the stars, and consequently the sacred books of all ages have indorsed the belief general at the time. You will find in our sacred books the astronomy, the geology, the philosophy and the morality of the ancient barbarians. The religionist takes these general ideas as his foundation, and upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them builds the supernatural structure. For many centuries the astronomy, geology, philosophy and morality of our bible were accepted. They were not questioned, for the reason that the world was too ignorant to question.

A few centuries ago the art of printing was invented. A new world was discovered. There was a complete revolution in commerce. The arts were born again. The world was filled with adventure; millions became self-reliant; old ideas were abandoned—old theories were put aside—and suddenly, the old leaders of thought were found to be ignorant, shallow and dishonest. The literature of the classic world was discovered and translated into modern languages. The world was circumnavigated; Copernicus discovered the true relation sustained by our earth to the solar system, and about the beginning of the seventeenth century many other wonderful discoveries were made. In 1609, a Hollander found that two lenses placed in a certain relation to each other magnified objects seen through them. This discovery was the foundation of astronomy. In a little while it came to the knowledge of Galileo; the result was a telescope, with which man has read the volume of the skies.

On the 8th day of May, 1618, Kepler discovered the greatest of his three laws. These were the first great blows struck for the enfranchisement of the human mind. A few began to suspect that the ancient Hebrews were not astronomers. From that moment the Church became the enemy of Science. In every possible way the inspired ignorance was defended—the lash, the sword, the chain, the fagot and the dungeon were the arguments used by the infuriated Church.

To such an extent was the Church prejudiced against the new philosophy, against the new facts, that priests refused to look through the telescope of Galileo.

At last it became evident to the intelligent world that the inspired writings, literally translated, did not contain the truth—the bible was in danger of being driven from the heavens.

The Church also had its geology. The time when the earth was created had been definitely fixed and was certainly known. This fact had not only been stated by inspired writers, but their statement had been indorsed by priests, by bishops, cardinals, popes and ecumenical councils; that was settled.

But a few men had learned the art of seeing. There were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some eyes not always closed in prayer. They looked at the things about them; they observed channels that had been worn in solid rock by streams; they saw the vast territories that had been deposited by rivers; their attention was called to the slow inroads upon continents by seas—to the deposits by volcanos—to the sedimentary rocks—to the vast reefs that had been built by the coral, and to the countless evidences of age, of the lapse of time—and finally it was demonstrated that this earth had been pursuing its course about the sun for millions and millions of ages.

The Church disputed every step, denied every fact, resorted to every device that cunning could suggest or ingenuity execute, but the conflict could not be maintained. The bible, so far as geology was concerned, was in danger of being driven from the earth.

Beaten in the open field, the Church began to equivocate, to evade, and to give new meanings to inspired words. Finally, falsehood having failed to harmonize the guesses of barbarians with the discoveries of genius, the leading churchmen suggested that the bible was not written to teach astronomy, was not written to teach geology, and that it was not a scientific book, but that it was written in the language of the people, and that as to unimportant things it contained the general beliefs of its time.

The ground was then taken that, while it was not inspired in its science, it was inspired in its morality, in its prophecy, in its account of the miraculous, in the scheme of salvation, and in all that it had to say on the subject of religion.

The moment it was suggested that the bible was not inspired in everything within its lids, the seeds of suspicion were sown. The priest became less arrogant. The Church was forced to explain. The pulpit had one language for the faithful and another for the philosophical, *i. e.*, it became dishonest with both.

The next question that arose was as to the origin of man.

The bible was being driven from the skies. The testimony of the stars was against the sacred volume. The Church had also been forced to admit that the world was not created at the time mentioned in the bible—so that the very stones of the earth rose and united with the stars in giving testimony against the sacred volume.

As to the creation of the world, the Church resorted to the artifice of saying that "days" in reality meant long periods of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time; so that no matter how old the earth was, the time could be spanned by six periods—in other words, that the years could not be too numerous to be divided by six.

But when it came to the creation of man, this evasion, or artifice, was impossible. The bible gives the date of the creation of man, because it gives the age at which the first man died, and then it gives the generations from Adam to the Flood, and from the Flood to the birth of Christ, and in many instances the actual age of the principal ancestor is given. So that, according to this account—according to the inspired figures—man has existed upon the earth only about six thousand years. There is no room left for any people beyond Adam.

If the bible is true, certainly Adam was the first man; consequently, we know, if the sacred volume be true, just how long man has lived and labored and suffered on this earth.

The Church cannot and dare not give up the account of the Creation of Adam from the dust of the earth, and of Eve from the rib of the man. The Church cannot give up the story of the Garden of Eden—the Serpent—the Fall and the Expulsion: these must be defended because they are vital. Without these absurdities, the system known as Christianity cannot exist. Without the Fall, the Atonement is a non sequitur. Facts bearing upon these questions were discovered and discussed by the greatest and most thoughtful of men. Lamarck, Humboldt, Haeckel, and above all, Darwin, not only asserted, but demonstrated, that man is not a special creation. If anything can be established by observation, by reason, then the fact has been established that man is related to all life below him—that he has been slowly produced through countless years—that the story of Eden is a childish myth—that the Fall of Man is an infinite absurdity.

If anything can be established by analogy and reason, man has existed upon the earth for many millions of ages. We know now, if we know anything, that people not only existed before Adam, but that they existed in a highly civilized state; that thousands of years before the Garden of Eden was planted men communicated to each other their ideas by language, and that artists clothed the marble with thoughts and passions.

This is a demonstration that the origin of man given in the Old Testament is untrue—that the account was written by the ignorance, the prejudice and the egotism of the olden time.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So, if anything outside of the senses can be known, we do know that civilization is a growth—that man did not commence a perfect being, and then degenerate, but that from small beginnings he has slowly risen to the intellectual height he now occupies.

The Church, however, has not been willing to accept these truths, because they contradict the sacred word. Some of the most ingenious of the clergy have been endeavoring for years to show that there is no conflict—that the account in Genesis is in perfect harmony with the theories of Charles Darwin, and these clergymen in some way manage to retain their creed and to accept a philosophy that utterly destroys it.

But in a few years the Christian world will be forced to admit that the bible is not inspired in its astronomy, in its geology, or in its anthropology—that is to say, that the inspired writers knew nothing of the sciences, knew nothing of the origin of the earth, nothing of the origin of man—in other words, nothing of any particular value to the human race.

It is, however, still insisted that the bible is inspired in its morality. Let us examine this question.

We must admit, if we know anything, if we feel anything, if conscience is more than a word, if there is such a thing as right and such a thing as wrong beneath the dome of heaven—we must admit that slavery is immoral. If we are honest, we must also admit that the Old Testament upholds slavery. It will be cheerfully admitted that Jehovah was opposed to the enslavement of one Hebrew by another. Christians may quote the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" as being opposed to human slavery, but after that commandment was given, Jehovah himself told his chosen people that they might "buy their bondmen and bondwomen of the heathen round about, and that they should be their bondmen and their bondwomen forever." So all that Jehovah meant by the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" was that one Hebrew should not steal from another Hebrew, but that all Hebrews might steal from the people of any other race or creed.

It is perfectly apparent that the ten commandments were made only for the Jews, not for the world, because the author of these commandments commanded the people to whom they were given to violate them nearly all as against the surrounding people.

A few years ago it did not occur to the Christian world that slavery was wrong. It was upheld by the Church. Ministers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bought and sold the very people for whom they declared that Christ had died. Clergymen of the English church owned stock in slave ships, and the man who denounced slavery was regarded as the enemy of morality, and thereupon was duly mobbed by the followers of Jesus Christ. Churches were built with the results of labor stolen from colored Christians. Babes were sold from mothers and a part of the money given to send missionaries from America to heathen lands with the tidings of great joy. Now, every intelligent man on the earth, every decent man, holds in abhorrence the institution of human slavery.

So with the institution of polygamy. If anything on the earth is immoral, that is. If there is anything calculated to destroy home, to do away with human love, to blot out the idea of family life, to cover the hearthstone with serpents, it is the institution of polygamy. The Jehovah of the Old Testament was a believer in that institution.

Can we now say that the bible is inspired in its morality? Consider for a moment the manner in which, under the direction of Jehovah, wars were waged. Remember the atrocities that were committed. Think of a war where everything was the food of the sword. Think for a moment of a deity capable of committing the crimes that are described and gloated over in the Old Testament. The civilized man has outgrown the sacred cruelties and absurdities.

There is still another side to this question.

A few centuries ago nothing was more natural than the unnatural. Miracles were as plentiful as actual events. In those blessed days, that which actually occurred was not regarded of sufficient importance to be recorded. A religion without miracles would have excited derision. A creed that did not fill the horizon—that did not account for everything—that could not answer every question, would have been regarded as worthless.

After the birth of Protestantism, it could not be admitted by the leaders of the Reformation that the Catholic Church still had the power of working miracles. If the Catholic Church was still in partnership with God, what excuse could have been made for the Reformation? The Protestants took the ground that the age of miracles had passed. This was to justify the new faith. But Protestants could not say that miracles had never been performed, because that would take the foundation not only from the Catho-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lics but from themselves; consequently, they were compelled to admit that miracles were performed in the Apostolic days, but to insist that, in their time, man must rely upon the facts in nature. Protestants were compelled to carry on two kinds of war: they had to contend with those who insisted that miracles had never been performed; and in that argument they were forced to insist upon the necessity for miracles, on the probability that they were performed, and upon the truthfulness of the Apostles. A moment afterward, they had to answer those who contended that miracles were performed at that time; then they brought forward against the Catholics the same arguments that their first opponents had brought against them.

This has made every Protestant brain "a house divided against itself." This planted in the Reformation the "irrepressible conflict."

But we have learned more and more about what we call Nature—about what we call facts. Slowly it dawned upon the mind that force is indestructible—that we cannot imagine force as existing apart from matter—that we cannot even think of matter existing apart from force—that we cannot by any possibility conceive of a cause without an effect, of an effect without a cause, of an effect that is not also a cause. We find no room between the links of cause and effect for a miracle. We now perceive that a miracle must be outside of Nature—that it can have no father, no mother—that is to say, that it is an impossibility.

The intellectual world has abandoned the miraculous. Most ministers are now ashamed to defend a miracle. Some try to explain miracles, and yet, if a miracle is explained, it ceases to exist. Few congregations could keep from smiling were the minister to seriously assert the truth of the Old Testament miracles.

Miracles must be given up. That field must be abandoned by the religious world. The evidence accumulates every day, in every possible direction in which the human mind can investigate, that the miraculous is simply the impossible.

Confidence in the eternal constancy of Nature increases day by day. The scientist has perfect confidence in the attraction of gravitation—in chemical affinities—in the great fact of evolution, and feels absolutely certain that the nature of things will remain forever the same.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have at last ascertained that miracles can be perfectly understood; that there is nothing mysterious about them; that they are simply transparent falsehoods.

The real miracles are the facts in nature. No one can explain the attraction of gravitation. No one knows why soil and rain and light become the womb of life. No one knows why grass grows, why water runs, or why the magnetic needle points to the north. The facts in nature are the eternal and the only mysteries. There is nothing strange about the miracles of superstition. They are nothing but the mistakes of ignorance and fear, or falsehoods framed by those who wished to live on the labor of others.

In our time the champions of Christianity, for the most part, take the exact ground occupied by the deists. They dare not defend in the open field the mistakes, the cruelties, the immoralities and the absurdities of the bible. They shun the Garden of Eden as though the serpent was still there. They have nothing to say about the Fall of Man. They are silent as to the laws upholding slavery and polygamy. They are ashamed to defend the miraculous. They talk about these things to Sunday-schools and to the elderly members of their congregations; but when doing battle for the faith, they misstate the position of their opponents and then insist that there must be a God, and that the soul is immortal.

We may admit the existence of an infinite being; we may admit the immortality of the soul, and yet deny the inspiration of the scriptures and the divine origin of the Christian religion. These doctrines, or these dogmas, have nothing in common. The pagan world believed in God and taught the dogma of immortality. These ideas are far older than Christianity, and they have been almost universal.

Christianity asserts more than this. It is based upon the inspiration of the bible, on the Fall of Man, on the Atonement, on the dogma of the Trinity, on the divinity of Jesus Christ, on his resurrection from the dead, on his ascension into heaven.

Christianity teaches not simply the immortality of the soul—not simply the immortality of joy—but it teaches the immortality of pain, the eternity of sorrow. It insists that evil, that wickedness, that immorality and that every form of vice are and must be perpetuated forever. It believes in immortal convicts, in eternal imprisonment and in a world of unending pain. It has a serpent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for every breast and a curse for nearly every soul. This doctrine is called the dearest hope of the human heart, and he who attacks it is denounced as the most infamous of men.

Let us see what the Church, within a few years, has been compelled substantially to abandon,—that is to say what it is now almost ashamed to defend.

First, the astronomy of the sacred scriptures; *second,* the geology; *third,* the account given of the origin of man; *fourth,* the doctrine of original sin, the fall of the human race; *fifth,* the mathematical contradiction known as the Trinity; *sixth,* the atonement—because it was only on the ground that man is accountable for the sin of another, that he could be justified by reason of the righteousness of another; *seventh,* that the miraculous is either the misunderstood or the impossible; *eighth,* that the bible is not inspired in its morality, for the reason that slavery is not moral, that polygamy is not good, that wars of extermination are not merciful, and that nothing can be more immoral than to punish the innocent on account of the sins of the guilty; and *ninth,* the divinity of Christ.

All this must be given up by the really intelligent, by those not afraid to think, by those who have the courage of their convictions and the candor to express their thoughts. What then is left?

Let me tell you. Everything in the bible that is true, is left; it still remains and is still of value. It cannot be said too often that the truth needs no inspiration; neither can it be said too often that inspiration cannot help falsehood. Every good and noble sentiment uttered in the bible is still good and noble. Every fact remains. All that is good in the Sermon on the Mount is retained. The Lord's Prayer is not affected. The grandeur of self denial, the nobility of forgiveness and the ineffable splendor of mercy are with us still. And besides there remains the great hope for all the human race.

What is lost? All the mistakes, all the falsehoods, all the absurdities, all the cruelties and all the curses contained in the Scriptures. We have almost lost the "hope" of eternal pain—the "consolation" of perdition; and in time we shall lose the frightful shadow that has fallen upon so many hearts, that has darkened so many lives.

The great trouble for many years has been, and still is, that the clergy are not quite candid. They are disposed to defend the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old creed. They have been educated in the Universities of the Sacred Mistake—Universities that Bruno would call "the widows of true learning." They have been taught to measure with a false standard; they have weighed with inaccurate scales. In youth, they became convinced of the truth of the creed. This was impressed upon them by the solemnity of professors who spoke in tones of awe. The enthusiasm of life's morning was misdirected. They went out into the world knowing nothing of value. They preached a creed outgrown. Having been for so many years entirely certain of their position, they met doubt with a spirit of irritation—afterwards with hatred. They are hardly courageous enough to admit that they are wrong.

Once the pulpit was the leader—it spoke with authority. By its side was the sword of the State, with the hilt toward its hand. Now, it is apologized for—it carries a weight. It is now like a living man to whom has been chained a corpse. It cannot defend the old, and it has not accepted the new. In some strange way it imagines that morality cannot live except in partnership with the sanctified follies and falsehoods of the past.

The old creeds cannot be defended by argument. They are not within the circumference of reason—they are not embraced in any of the facts within the experience of man. All the subterfuges have been exposed; all the excuses have been shown to be shallow, and at last the Church must meet, and fairly meet, the objections of our time.

Solemnity is no longer an argument. Falsehood is no longer sacred. People are not willing to admit that mistakes are divine. Truth is more important than belief—far better than creeds, vastly more useful than superstitions. The Church must accept the truths of the present, must admit the demonstrations of science, or take its place in the mental museums with the fossils and monstrosities of the past.

The time for personalities has passed; these questions cannot be determined by ascertaining the character of the disputants; epithets are no longer regarded as arguments; the curse of the Church produces laughter; theological slander is no longer a weapon; argument must be answered with argument, and the Church must appeal to reason, and by that standard it must stand or fall. The theories and discoveries of Darwin cannot be answered by the resolutions of synods, or by quotations from the Old Testament.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The world has advanced. The bible has remained the same. We must go back to the book—it cannot come to us—or we must leave it forever. In order to remain orthodox we must forget the discoveries, the inventions, the intellectual efforts of many centuries; we must go back until our knowledge—or rather our ignorance—will harmonize with the barbaric creeds.

It is not pretended that all the creeds have not been naturally produced. It is admitted that under the same circumstances the same religions would again ensnare the human race. It is also admitted that under the same circumstances the same efforts would be made by the great and intellectual of every age to break the chains of superstition.

There is no necessity of attacking people—we should combat error. We should hate hypocrisy, but not the hypocrite—larceny, but not the thief—superstition, but not its victim. We should do all within our power to inform, to educate, and to benefit our fellow men.

There is no elevating power in hatred. There is no reformation in punishment. The soul grows greater and grander in the air of kindness, in the sunlight of intelligence.

We must rely upon the evidence of our senses, upon the conclusions of our reason.

For many centuries the Church has insisted that man is totally depraved, that he is naturally wicked, that all of his natural desires are contrary to the will of God. Only a few years ago it was solemnly asserted that our senses were originally honest, true and faithful, but having been debauched by original sin, were now cheats and liars; that they constantly deceived and misled the soul; that they were traps and snares; that no man could be safe who relied upon his senses, or upon his reason;—he must simply rely upon faith; in other words, that the only way for man to really see was to put out his eyes.

There has been a rapid improvement in the intellectual world. The improvement has been slow in the realm of religion, for the reason that religion was hedged about, defended and barricaded by fear, by prejudice and by law. It was considered sacred. It was illegal to call its truth in question. Whoever disputed the priest became a criminal; whoever demanded a reason, or an explanation, became a blasphemer, a scoffer, a moral leper.

The Church defended its mistakes by every means within its power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in spite of all this there has been advancement, and there are enough of the orthodox clergy left to make it possible for us to measure the distance that has been traveled by sensible people.

The world is beginning to see that a minister should be a teacher, and that "he should not endeavor to inculcate a particular systems of dogmas, but to prepare his hearers for exercising their own judgments."

As a last resource, the orthodox tell the thoughtful that they are not "spiritual"—that they are "of the earth, earthy"—that they cannot perceive that which is spiritual. They insist that "God is a spirit, and must be worshiped in spirit."

But let me ask, What is it to be spiritual? In order to be really spiritual, must a man sacrifice this world for the sake of another? Were the selfish hermits, who deserted their wives and children for the miserable purpose of saving their own little souls, spiritual? Were those who put their fellow men in dungeons, or burned them at the stake on account of a difference of opinion, all spiritual people? Did John Calvin give evidence of his spirituality by burning Servetus? Were they spiritual people who invented and used instruments of torture—who denied the liberty of thought and expression—who waged wars for the propagation of the faith? Were they spiritual people who insisted that Infinite Love could punish his poor, ignorant children forever? Is it necessary to believe in eternal torment to understand the meaning of the word spiritual? Is it necessary to hate those who disagree with you, and to calumniate those whose argument you cannot answer, in order to be spiritual? Must you hold a demonstrated fact in contempt; must you deny or avoid what you know to be true, in order to substantiate the fact that you are spiritual?

What is it to be spiritual? Is the man spiritual who searches for the truth—who lives in accordance with his highest ideal—who loves his wife and children—who discharges his obligations—who makes a happy fireside for the ones he loves—who succors the oppressed—who gives his honest opinions—who is guided by principle—who is merciful and just?

Is the man spiritual who loves the beautiful—who is thrilled by music, and touched to tears in the presence of the sublime, the heroic and the self-denying? Is the man spiritual who endeavors by thought and deed to ennoble the human race?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The defenders of the orthodox faith, by this time, should know that the foundations are insecure.

They should have the courage to defend, or the candor to abandon. If the bible is an inspired book, it ought to be true. Its defenders must admit that Jehovah knew the facts not only about the earth, but about the stars, and that the Creator of the universe knew all about geology and astronomy even four thousand years ago.

The champions of Christianity must show that the bible tells the truth about the Creation of Man, the Garden of Eden, the Temptation, the Fall and the Flood. They must take the ground that the sacred book is historically correct; that the events related really happened; that the miracles were actually performed; that the laws promulgated from Sinai were and are wise and just, and that nothing is upheld, commanded, indorsed, or in any way approved or sustained that is not absolutely right. In other words, if they insist that a being of infinite goodness and intelligence is the author of the bible, they must be ready to show that it is absolutely perfect. They must defend its astronomy, geology, history, miracle and morality.

If the bible is true, man is a special creation, and if man is a special creation, millions of facts must have conspired, millions of ages ago, to deceive the scientific world of to-day.

If the bible is true, slavery is right, and the world should go back to the barbarism of the lash and chain. If the bible is true, polygamy is the highest form of virtue. If the bible is true, Nature has a master, and the miraculous is independent of and superior to cause and effect. If the bible is true, most of the children of men are destined to suffer eternal pain. If the bible is true, the science known as astronomy is a collection of mistakes—the telescope is a false witness, and light is a luminous liar. If the bible is true, the science known as geology is false and every fossil is a petrified perjurer.

The defenders of orthodox creeds should have the courage to candidly answer at least two questions: *First*, Is the bible inspired? *Second*, Is the bible true? And when they answer these questions, they should remember that if the bible is true, it needs no inspiration, and that if not true, inspiration can do it no good.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MENACING IRRUPTION.

THE individual who is regular in his habits, who eats his meals at stated times, taking care not to partake of too much food at once, will live to a greater age and enjoy better health than the person who leads an irregular and intemperate life. The reason is plain. The system is nourished at the right time and with food sufficient to supply the demands of nature. As the nation is the individual in concrete, it follows that the same rule should apply and that no more than enough should be taken at a time. That which gives life to an individual is the food which enters and strengthens the system. That which sustains life in a nation is its population.

If an individual studies the laws of nature and will eat nutritious, wholesome food, such as will agree with him, he will find that he can enjoy life far better than the person whose menu is made up of ill-cooked, indigestible viands. This rule will also hold good when applied to the nation. Immigration is to the United States what certain kinds of food are to the human system. When its tide flows in regularly; is made up of enlightened, well disposed people; when too many are not landed at once on our shores, it cannot but prove beneficial and healthy. Those who come must do so of their own volition and not because of undue influence on the part of interested parties.

The flow of immigration which came prior to 1860 was of a far different character from that which has been tending in this direction since, and the conditions under which immigrants must begin life in the United States have been almost entirely revolutionized within the past decade. The immigrant of the sixties found it comparatively easy to earn a living, and he was not obliged to crowd his neighbor in order to make room for one more. To the immigration which came previous to 1860 we owe our greatness as a nation; it gave us brain, bone and muscle; it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made our rivers navigable, and when they could not carry our merchandise it made the canals and then the railroads; it gave us laborers, mechanics and statesmen; it was healthy and good. Could we say the same of the immigration of the present day there would be no fault to find and none but narrow-minded bigots would complain. It is still dangerous to say anything concerning the restriction of immigration for fear of being charged with Know-Nothingism. Whatever Know-Nothingism meant in former years, the man who advocates a restriction of immigration to-day is a patriot who loves his country better than the opinion of demagogues, or of those who will not speak the truth because it may temporarily affect their interests. I do not base my objections to unrestricted immigration on race hatred, prejudice or bigotry. In what I have to say I am actuated by a sincere desire to benefit humanity. Nine million seven hundred thousand immigrants have landed since 1860; more than the combined populations of New York and Pennsylvania and as much as the total population of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Dakota, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington Territory, West Virginia and Wyoming.

The population which came previous to 1860 was civilized, that which comes to-day is, in a great proportion, semi-barbarous. Who doubts that statement has only to travel along the line of railroad nearest to him until he meets with a gang of laborers and attempts to converse with them. He has only to go into the mining regions of Pennsylvania, the mills of Ohio, the factories of New England, the lumber camps of Michigan, or Mulberry street, New York, to find a class of beings that are far from being civilized. One or two illustrations will suffice. Eight years ago I visited a mining camp and investigated the condition of the men who were imported, free of duty, to take the places of the American workmen who had demanded higher wages for labor done. Dining-room, smoking-room, sitting-room, kitchen and bedchamber all in one. Five rows of bunks, three deep, each one thirty inches in width and seventy-eight inches long. The first bunk, eighteen inches from the floor, the next supported by rough hemlock posts but two feet above it, and a third two feet above the second one. Each bunk filled with straw and covered with the coarsest kind of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coffee sack material for bed clothing. Two rows of hemlock boards, each one twenty feet in length by three feet in width, constituted the tables. The men came in from the mines while I was there, and before washing face or hand sat down to a meal of salt pork, meal and water. One hundred and five men lived in a building one hundred and sixty feet in length by thirty feet in width. Addressing one of them in the English tongue I received no answer. I waited until it was time to retire, and saw these men lie down without divesting themselves of a single article of clothing; some of them took off their shoes, but the greater portion of them did not.

These men took the places of American workmen who were receiving from two to two dollars and a half a day. The compensation allowed to them was but seventy-five cents a day and board. A careful estimate showed that five and one-eighth cents would provide a meal such as I saw spread on that table, thus making the outlay on each man but ninety and three-eighths cents a day. One year ago I visited the same place in company with the same escort, and found but one of the one hundred and five men who were there seven years before. Inquiry developed the fact that the others had at different intervals returned to their homes across the sea. I have witnessed hundreds of scenes like that in several States, and inquiry always elicited the same information regarding the movements of such men. They return to their homes when they have accumulated a few hundred dollars. They receive the lowest possible wages while in this country, and take nearly all of it home with them when going. The greater portion, by far, of what they spend in America is for strong drink. Two weeks ago I saw a number of men at work on a railroad. Attached to the waist-band of each man was a leather strap fastened to a large brass check similar to those used by railway companies when checking baggage. Every check bore a number, and the man who carried it, or to whom it was fastened, was known by the number on his check. On the pay-rolls of the company he was known by his number, and if he had the misfortune to lose his check, he at the same time lost his wages unless the foreman would identify him for a consideration. These men spoke a tongue unknown to me, and the same story was told of their habits as was told of the men of eight years ago. Shanties of the roughest boards made up the homes of these poor fellows, and fare of the coarsest and filthiest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kind was given, or supplied them by the contractor. Fancy the future of the American laborer, whose name is forgotten, and whose only means of identification rests with a brass check, which may be substituted for another while he sleeps.

Investigation has demonstrated that those who remain in this country, of that class of immigrants, do not learn to speak our language with any degree of accuracy; they never read of the affairs of our government in the language of the country, and seldom know how to read any other language.

The majority of that class of immigrants comes here under contract or after undue influence has been brought to bear on them by agents of American employers. Another class of aliens rush hither fleeing from oppression at home. Others come as our cashiers go to Canada, because of the offenses committed at home; with this difference, those who go to Canada bring American dollars with them, while those who commit crime in foreign lands bring nothing with them but depraved habits and vengeful hearts, and when those who can do so return to their own lands, they, too, take American dollars with them.

Every European country is infested with agents of American and English syndicates who offer tempting inducements to Europeans to emigrate to America. That this is true is beyond question. That these poor foreigners are welcomed by mercenary-hearted Americans, whose selfishness has killed their patriotism, is true. In verification of that assertion let me quote from the secret circular sent out by Henry Clews & Co. last year, and published in the papers a year ago. It reads:

"The tide of immigration this way, the arrivals yesterday at least ten thousand, which is the largest on record for any one day, should be considered as a favorable feature, especially as the new comers are largely from the continent, and bring funds with them for their immediate support. In the present disturbed condition of labor this large flow of immigration comes at an opportune time. What this country needs more than anything else is the same competition in the labor market as is found in all manufacturing and product markets. Competition alone will out-maneuver in the end all the generals who are leading the Knights of Labor. Competition alone will prove the only pacifier of labor dissatisfaction and uprising. All American citizens here who want peace and prosperity should unite in encouraging the European surplus population to flock to our shores to bring about the true remedy for the present labor evils, which is the only cloud now overhanging our present prosperous country."

In the same circular reference is made to the gloomy outlook for all Europe which has made investment in European securities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unprofitable, yet Henry Clews & Co. would transfer that surplus population which has unsettled Europe to American soil for the purpose, not of building up the country, but that it might become the willing instrument in the hands of money getters here. No thought of the country's welfare inspired that circular.

Let us consider what the surplus population of Europe means when transplanted to this country. Dissatisfied with their surroundings at home many come with vengeance in their hearts. Coming from lands where oppression reigns they regard liberty as license on this side and soon find their way into the police courts. Unacquainted with our laws they do not know how to obey them. Being a surplus on the other side, they cannot, as alleged by Henry Clews & Co., "bring funds with them." They come as paupers and as paupers they remain; they come to compete in the struggle for food with the American workman.

Place a few intelligent but unscrupulous men of their own race at the head of these men, and continue to turn the screws as they have been turned for the past few years in the field of competition, and the safety of the republic will be seriously threatened. Brought to America to occupy that sphere in life outlined in the circular of Henry Clews & Co., deceived and cheated by those of their own race who may understand the language and customs of this country, robbed by their employers, their ignorance taken advantage of on every hand, it must not be expected that they will entertain any feelings of love or respect for this country or her institutions. Having been used as the club with which employers struck down the independence of the American laborer, it must not be expected that the latter will cherish a very friendly feeling for either immigrant or employer. Every dead wall in the cities of Europe is placarded with highly colored handbills which set forth the advantages of emigration to America. When on landing in New York, when the illusion is dispelled and every future step is in an opposite direction from that which was expected, we must not hope that such as have been deceived will ever become good and useful citizens. The object in bringing them hither is not that they may become citizens, but slaves. Those who do not come up to the requirements of citizenship cannot be called freemen, and their influence on the labor market is so degrading and baneful, that they are every day reducing the condition of the American workman to a parallel with their own. Our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land laws are not based on equity, for under them it is possible for the man of wealth to possess millions of acres. Our railroads enjoy privileges which give their owners a power which the Emperor of Russia does not possess, and that power is being directed toward the complete overthrow of our republican form of government. Our factories, great and small, our mines and water privileges, are being cornered under the sway of the "Trust." Our legislatures are already of so purchaseable a character as to be regarded as the rightful property of the highest bidder. There are men in New York City who claim that they can tell within a thousand dollars of what it will cost to buy up sufficient of the Legislature of the State of New York to put through any scheme desired by the railroad or monopoly interests of that State. As a nation we must within the next ten years completely divest the railroads and other corporations of their autocratic power, or they will subject us to the sway of an oligarchy, which will rule, not by divine right or by reason of superior birth, but through the power which wealth confers upon its possessors. Humane, but short sighted, men assert that it is wrong to stem the tide of immigration; that this is the land of the oppressed, and we should so frame our laws as to deal equitably by all who seek a shelter within our borders. The day for such sentiment has gone by, and we must open our eyes to realities and face the danger which confronts us. This is not only the land of the oppressed, but the oppressor as well, and a nation born under such auspices as the American Republic should contain neither. It is conceded that to remedy existing evils, such as I have mentioned, we must enact wise legislation. How can that be done with the source, the fountain head of legislation, within the power of wealth and ignorance? Two illustrations will explain as well as a volume.

In a lumber town in Michigan at the last general election over four hundred votes were cast. Citizens who have a right to know tell me that there are not more than fifty legal voters in the town, the remainder is made up of that class of immigrants of which I write. The owner of the lumber mills acted as judge of election. Owning the mills which make the town, he also owns the people so far as their right to act independently is concerned. That man required the services of an unscrupulous, willing tool in the legislature, and obliged his employés, the majority of whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were not residents of this country over one year, to go to the polls and vote for the man of his choice. The qualifications of citizenship were disregarded, not by the willful act of the ignorant workman, but by the intelligent unscrupulous employer, whose love of pocket overshadowed love of country. It was "vote as I dictate or you are discharged," and the poor wretches had no alternative but to obey. That one instance, and its parallel can be duplicated by the hundred, shows what can be done with ignorant men; and to hope for a reform of existing evils, to expect that our laws can be amended while the tide of raw, undisciplined, willing serfs is swelling in on us by the million, while they are being used as voting instruments which neutralize the best efforts of patriots, is little short of madness. Those who are serfs at home do not become freemen in a day when transplanted to other soil. How can a law which allows one man to rule a million acres be repealed when we import millions of slaves to vote as that man wills?

Seneca once asked: "How great would be our peril if our slaves began to number us?" How great will be the peril of the republic if the number of those who do not appreciate it ever reach a majority? With poverty staring the workman in the face, with competition driving the children out of the school room and into the workshop, with immigration pouring its unlettered hordes upon our coast, it is but fair to presume that ignorance will increase in spite of our best efforts. Where ignorance dominates slavery is the result; where ignorance exists race hatreds, prejudices and distinctions will create strife and internal warfare. Where ignorance prevails citizenship is a farce, and the ballot in the hands of those who know not how to use it becomes the most powerful aid to the money held by the few.

American employers do not, as a rule, care to employ independent American citizens. In Reading, Pa., there is an iron manufacturing company which employs several hundred men. Four years ago, that firm employed only citizens of the United States; previous to an election, these men were told by the owner of the mill that he expected that they would vote in accordance with his wishes; some of them complied, and others disregarded his mandate. To-day, only three men, outside of his clerks and foremen, are American citizens—the remainder have been imported; and while more men are required to do the work, they do not command the wages that their predecessors did, they are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more docile, and though they may never be able to understand the English tongue, if they become citizens they will know how to vote as the owner of that mill wishes.

On Saturday, July 7, over two thousand Americans sailed from New York to various parts of Europe. They go to spend the summer abroad. It is estimated that the cheapest three months tour that can be made in Europe will exceed five hundred dollars. Many of those who sailed on the 7th will spend ten times that amount while abroad; but it is safe to say that the two thousand tourists will average a thousand dollars each, which will in the aggregate reach the sum of two millions of dollars. On the week ending Saturday, July 7, the number of immigrants which landed at Castle Garden was 5,161. I doubt if they brought two millions of dollars with them for "their immediate support," and if they did, this country made nothing by the exchange. But it is estimated that the total sum which they brought with them did not exceed thirty thousand dollars, which leaves the balance of one million, nine hundred and seventy thousand dollars in favor of Europe. Those who went to Europe did not leave vacancies in the ranks of labor, and they took with them what had been earned for them by the American workman, and in their place we find 5,161 foreigners dumped in upon the American laborer's shoulders, demanding that he divide up what little of his earnings he has left, after paying the expenses of his employer to Europe.

So long as this tide of unrestricted immigration is permitted to sweep in they will take no steps to reform conditions at home. We must check it at once, or instead of Americanizing those who come they will Europeanize us.

It is suggested that we oblige the foreigner to reside twenty-one years in the United States before allowing him to become a citizen. Those who advocate such a course of treatment should remember that we do not require these people simply to work, they should bear a portion of the burdens of citizenship and should be taught what it means. To my mind the better plan would be to oblige every person who contemplates emigrating to this country to file a declaration of such intention with the American Consul next to his place of residence at least three years before date of emigration. Make it the duty of the representative of the United States Government abroad to ascertain what the char-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acter of the applicant is, what his qualifications for citizenship are, and what his intentions are. Allow only those who come bearing a certificate from the United States consul to land. Oblige the immigrant to declare his intentions to become an American citizen the day he lands, and instruct him that unless he qualifies by learning to read the Declaration of American Independence and the Constitution of the United States, so as to be able to interpret these documents in an intelligible manner, he will forfeit his right to remain longer than five years.

There are other considerations aside from the question of citizenship which demand that we take steps at once to check the influx of immigration. If "self preservation is the first law of nature," it is high time that we yield obedience to that law. We placed a barrier between the Chinaman and our coast, not because he did not behave himself, not because he was vicious or particularly bad, but because he interfered with the right of the American to earn his living, and for that same reason must we say to the people of all lands that they are not wanted here so long as the conditions are such as to inflict hardship on immigrant and citizen (native and naturalized) alike.

The Irish Land League taught the doctrine of Ireland for the Irish, and sought to prevent the people of Ireland from emigrating. The Knights of Labor, as an organization, is spreading throughout the world, and its principal feature is to teach its members and others that the land in which a man is born owes him something more than oppressive laws and unjust restrictions which prevent him from earning a living. In every country abroad that organization is to place a declaration of principles before the people, selecting some particular feature around which to rally. The members are to be taught to reform existing abuses at home, so that emigration for the purpose of bettering their lot will not be necessary; they are to be taught that the right to enjoy life in the land of his birth is inherent in man. Once these doctrines begin to spread abroad the people will begin to take more of an interest in home affairs. To assist foreigners to improve their condition at home, it is not necessary to reduce our own people to a condition bordering on serfdom by loading us down with a helpless surplus population which can at best be used only to the advantage of monopoly.

During the next few months we will hear a great deal concern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the protection of American labor from the products of the pauper labor of Europe. Nine out of every ten will know but little about the subject unless he has worked for wages himself. Which of them will have the manhood and courage to demand that we be protected from the pauper and the criminals who have been dumped by the hundred thousand upon the already overburdened backs of the workingmen of this country?

Which man—which party—will have the courage to say: "From this day forward no person shall be allowed to land on American soil who has not filed an application with an American consul to be permitted to emigrate to the United States, at least three years prior to date of sailing. No person who cannot read and write shall be admitted, no paupers, imbeciles, or criminals shall be permitted to land, and all who do come must declare their intentions to become citizens the day they land, and shall study the principles, the constitution and laws of our country before being accepted as citizens."

Which party will take the same interest in the reduction of the surplus population as is taken in reducing the surplus in the treasury of the nation? Who will say we have imported enough for the present, let us stop until the surplus is exhausted? I believe it should be done.

T. V. POWDERLY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ART AND THE ACTOR.

"To be a well-favored man is the gift of fortune; but to read and write comes by nature."

It seems always to have been a popular belief that acting is the one art, the one profession that requires no preliminary training, no preparatory study.

The painter must be taught to draw, to understand the value of colors, must learn the laws of perspective and of optics. The musician must study harmony and thorough-bass, and by patient practice acquire technical skill. The poet must know the rules of grammar and the laws of metre; but a man is asked to step upon the stage and be an actor from that moment, without any other preparation than a desire to be an actor.

Now, however, the time seems to have come when many see the absurdity of such a view, though even yet there is a strong prejudice against anything like a systematic course of dramatic training. A young would-be actor seeking advice is sure to be told by nine persons out of ten: "Get an engagement as soon as you can; the stage is the best school." In the old days of universal stock companies, in theatres where a different play was produced every week, undoubtedly it was a most excellent school. But the young actor of to-day who is ambitious to grow in his art finds it very slow work while under the necessity of traveling through the country playing one part, of twenty or thirty lines, for a whole season. Such a situation does not offer very brilliant opportunities for development of the great art of dramatic expression.

And even if the conditions were the same as in the days of our fathers, why would it be such a preposterous thing to give our young actors their elementary training in schools and colleges instead of on the stage before a long-suffering and patient public? Surely in institutions devoted to this purpose, under efficient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

management, it could be accomplished more thoroughly and in much less time than through the slow and painful experiences of unguided effort. Genius, of course, will assert itself in any circumstances. It trains itself and knows its own needs better than any one else can know them; but even it, as a general thing, gains much by being directed in its infancy. And then most actors, like most other men and women, are not geniuses, and mere talent is not capable of reaching its highest development unaided.

Those who oppose the idea of dramatic training invariably argue, with an ignorance of facts which is remarkable, that none of the great actors of the past or present ever had any. They seem to imply that these actors were born with all their technical skill of expression as well as the great motive power of their genius. Let us see how much truth there is in this supposition.

Rachel was a pupil of the Paris "Conservatoire," and during all the period of her success she was a careful and patient student under her old master, Sanson. As soon as she began to grow careless of study the falling off in her art was marked.

Garrick was an untiring worker. He trained himself by a system of study and exercise which he continued during his whole career.

Edmund Kean, as a little boy, received constant instruction and drilling from the woman who took the place of his mother. When he grew to manhood he tramped the country for miles during the day studying the parts he was to play in the evening.

The case of Adelaide Neilson is a striking proof of the beneficial results of training. When she made her first important appearance in the Eastern States, artistically, she was an absolute failure, though her beauty drew large audiences. Her great but crude, uncultivated genius had not acquired through study the ability to rightly apply its power. She immediately recognized this fact and placed herself under the direction of different teachers, and ever afterwards studied her parts with some one competent to assist her. She died young, but she has left her name in the records of the stage as one of its most brilliant memories. Surely her example is worthy of consideration.

Sarah Bernhardt was a pupil of the Paris "Conservatoire."

Similar examples could be multiplied indefinitely, but these are sufficient to prove that even actors of genius do not spring

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

straight out of the arms of nature fully equipped for their work any more than do other artists, than do scientists, diplomatists, business men. Every one has some preliminary training to go through, whatever may be his or her line of occupation, before he or she can become even a *professor* of it—the actor no less than any one else.

The ground is constantly taken that an actor is but doing on the stage at night what he has been doing off it all day. He is expressing emotions he has been feeling, repeating actions he has been reiterating all his life. To be an actor he has only to do what he and every other man in the world has been doing since he was born,—a perfectly easy and simple matter surely! If so why cannot every man and woman on the face of the earth be an actor? Why are many actors so bad? Why cannot any body take a chair on the stage with the same ease and naturalness with which he can do it in the parlor or in the kitchen? Because acting is an *art* and not mere nature; because a person must be taught or teach himself how to sit on a chair when he would do it to consciously produce a particular effect, and not just because he happens to feel like it. To repeat the simplest action of every-day life upon the stage, and give it the appearance of spontaneity and naturalness, requires the presence of a particular element which is absent from the same action when it is the expression of an ordinary impulse. In the one case it is done with premeditation as a detail in the working out of a fixed design; in the other it is not anticipated or expected or simulated, and, besides, it is not watched by a thousand critics.

It is just as reasonable to expect a man to be an actor without training as to expect him to read without knowing the alphabet. Everybody, but the exceptional individual who is a deaf-mute, has a voice with which he can make a noise more or less musical. But the finest natural voice in the world will not give a woman the position of prima donna or a man that of first tenor if the voice is not cultivated. They must know how to modulate it, to pitch it, to sustain it, to *use* it. Surely if there is anything in the world one ought to know how to use without being shown how it is the voice. We talk more than we do anything else, and yet even in ordinary conversation there is not one person in a thousand, or in five thousand, who knows how to use his voice as he should.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the actor is to trust so entirely to nature, what is the necessity of stage management? Why cannot the characters move about the stage with the unpremeditated ease of impulse with which they would move about a drawing-room? In tragic moments of real life people express themselves forcibly and very much to the point, and will form pictures of startling intensity and vividness. What need of rehearsals, then, and careful study of the most minute effects when all the actors have to do is to wait for the situation and then just be themselves, and trust to luck not to walk over each other, or to die in the place where the stage manager would think the leading lady ought to faint or the agonized lover ought to kneel and call down vengeance from heaven? Such a performance would be likely to resemble an exhibition of parlor charades, where everybody speaks at once and moves at once, and there is a great deal of animated confusion and very little meaning.

The question is frequently discussed as to whether an actor should so identify himself with his part as to feel the emotions he is expressing, or should merely portray them outwardly, remaining untouched himself. In other words, whether he should feel his part or think his part. The general opinion would seem to be that the actor who feels cannot think, and the actor who thinks cannot feel. Is not this altogether a false idea? Is it not in reality the combination of intensity of feeling and vigor of thought that makes the great actor?—a combination so rarely found in any proportions approaching an even balance as to account for the rarity of genius on the stage?

The actor while on the stage is two distinct persons, acting and reacting upon each other, and the degree of harmony with which this is done marks the greatness of his talent or genius. It seems unquestionable that the more completely an actor can imbue himself with the feeling of his part, the more every fibre of his being thrills responsive to the situation he is in and to the words he speaks, the grander and truer will be his performance. But wait. The controlling element of mind must step in, or the only thing to do with such actors as are carried along on the passion of the character they are representing would be to hang them for manslaughter or shut them up in lunatic asylums. For instance, when *Desdemona* is to be smothered, the mental man interposes and says to the emotional man: "Stop; this is not a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case of actual murder. *Feel* as agonized, as frenzied as you can, but I don't intend to let you kill the lady who is playing *Desdemona.*"

Throughout the whole action of a play, stage effects and smoothness of representation require that each bit of stage business shall be done in a certain specified spot. If an actor has to faint, to fall, to die, he must do it always in one particular place and nowhere else, or he would disturb the whole action of the scene. Now the two men in him, the emotional man and the mental man, are both acting separately but at the same time and in perfect unison. The emotional man trembles, turns cold, pleads, the tears start to his eyes, his voice shakes and he falls. The mental man realizes where he is, at what time he must stagger across the stage, when he must reach the place where he sinks and dies.

This independent and harmonious duality is well illustrated by the numerous stories of the asides of actors, while in the fervor of some scene, to those on the stage near them. An amusing instance of the kind is told of a lady and gentleman who thoroughly and cordially disliked each other, and yet were obliged to appear constantly together in parts requiring the assumption of the deepest mutual affection. "One night, when he was playing at love she was to rush into his arms; being a true artist she did her work with energy, and between speeches he muttered: 'You need not swallow a man.' She replied: 'You are too bitter a dose.' While holding her in fond embrace, wrapped in a delicious transport, he growled in a whisper: 'Don't lean so hard against a man.' With her head in tender repose upon his breast she retorted: 'You are paid for holding me and I intend you shall earn your salary.'"

Jules Clarétie, the well-known writer of the French press, in an article published several years ago in the *London Athenæum*, tells us that Sarah Bernhardt, after thrilling her audiences to the shuddering point by the tragic intensity of her acting, "a moment later behind the scenes will make every one laugh, even down to the firemen." Her rehearsals of the great quarrel scene between the sisters in "Frou-Frou" were interrupted by bursts of merriment from *Frou-Frou* herself; and it was while at supper on one occasion that "she arranged the death of Madame de Sartorys."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This power to feel and yet keep the mind standing outside of the feeling is possessed by all to some extent, but should be so by the actor in a pre-eminent degree. Is not the high development of this faculty one of the most important elements of dramatic talent?

A very striking example of the separate action of the actor's emotional and mental centres is found in the experience of Talma at his mother's death-bed. He was a man of deep affections and he was devotedly attached to his mother. Her loss was to him a bitter and terrible grief, and yet, while he stood beside her couch, filled with the awful sorrow of the hour, watching the life fade from her eyes, his mind involuntarily and during the very intensity of his suffering, was noting the outward signs of the passage of her soul from the body as a *study* to be used in the exercise of his art. This throws much light on the actor's ability to feel his part intensely, to *be* the person he represents and at the same time to be himself to the extent of knowing what he is doing and how he is doing it—to feel and to know. If he only knows, he is cold, and can do nothing more, at best, than interest our intellects. If he only feels, he loses control of himself, and, consequently, loses control of his audience. He breaks the magnetic current by which he kept his hand on their pulse and swayed them *consciously* at his will.

In studying a character an actor must get an intellectual understanding of it and he must get the feeling of it. His intellectual understanding will classify it and determine its general bearing and tendency of expression. His feeling will bring him into sympathy with it, and prompt natural and spontaneous movements, gestures, modulations of voice, the propriety of which his mind must then decide upon. But it is impossible to absolutely separate the work of the two. They unite and second and check and complete each other. It is the harmonious union of these two elements, the masculine and the feminine, that creates an artistic performance. The same thing is true in regard to all other arts. But the actor's emotional nature can act more independently of his mentality than can that of the poet, the novelist, the painter. Their emotional realization of their subject must find expression more immediately through the channel of the intellect, and they must use the artificial instrument of pen or brush to give it life. The actor's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own body is his instrument and look, gesture, pose and voice are his means of expression. When an actor says: "I love you," he says it with his voice, his eyes, his face, his hands, his limbs, his whole body, as a man who is uttering his own personal feeling would do. The novelist, when one of his characters has the same words to speak, does not go through a similar pantomime while writing them—if he did and any one saw him, he might reasonably be taken for a lunatic. The emotion does not manifest itself by this direct and natural means, but is more dependent on his mental action for its expression.

A great advantage other artists possess over the actor is the time and opportunity they have to pass judgment upon their work, and correct it before finally giving it to the public. The actor does his work in the presence of his audience. No matter what the preliminary study of his part has been, it can only take life in the theatre, and it must stand as it then is. He cannot go back and efface errors and make improvements.

Of course the more spontaneous or intuitive is the working of the actor's mind in his study and in his performance, the truer, easier and more natural will be the result. The mind of genius in any line of work, instinctively finds the best way of expressing itself. The intuitive faculty is the highest, the most precious an actor can possess, and a course of study that would in any way interfere with or check it would be far worse than none at all. But there are certain things the actor must know and may be taught without incurring this danger—the technicalities of his art. Unless he has a thorough knowledge of these his talent or genius must be hampered, as a musician's would be by untrained fingers and an imperfect understanding of his instrument.

Acting is an art whose successful following requires rare natural gifts, devoted love, and conscientious work. The latter element is quite as necessary as the other two. In acting, as in singing, sculpture, painting, poetry, the subtle element of the ideal is its heart and centre and life, and representations of the ideal on the stage, as on canvas, as in verse, are not photographic copies of nature as we actually see it (though nature, of course, must be the foundation to build upon), but suggestions of its typical beauty, truth, strength, love; with the deep contrast of their reverse—vice, falseness, weakness, hate. The actor who would represent the ideal, needs the training, the discipline, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study of an artist. He must have something besides natural dramatic ability. In proportion as his intuition—that is his talent or genius—is developed, it will tell him *what* to do, but it is just as important then for him to be *able* to do it. He must have skill and finish of execution, as well as imagination to conceive, and soul to feel. He must have perfect knowledge of effects, perfect control of his voice and body, absolute command of himself in every situation. And this is what he can be taught. It all can be learnt and has been learnt by many on the stage itself. But the question is: Can the process not be made much easier, quicker, and surer in schools, where the first and most arduous part of the work can be gotten over, and from which young actors can go out not so wholly ignorant of the elements of their art as they now are?

In such schools, if properly organized and intelligently conducted, the body can be trained to a flexibility that will always respond to the will of the actor; he can learn to acquire the essential control of his facial muscles; his voice can be cultivated; he can be taught to sit, to stand, to walk as he must sit and stand and walk on the stage; awkwardness of movement, faultiness of intonation and of reading can be corrected; mannerisms can be checked. He can be taught the elements of repose. He can have actual stage practice through rehearsals and public performances that should be as strict as in a professional company. By such means it is surely possible, without in any way interfering with the natural bent or individuality of his talent, to guide and direct it towards its highest expression. Must not such a course of instruction with this end in view, and not that of elocutionary declamation, be a benefit to any aspirant to histrionic fame and a boon to the audiences before whom he may appear? It would result in raising the requirements necessary to be possessed by our actors. It would keep ignorant and energetic hope from harassing the public. It would clear the stage of the host of uneducated, inefficient persons, who have rushed to it from all sorts of motives but that of appreciation or love of the art. And the public will gladly pay for the finished and artistic performance.

We now go to the theatre to see Mr. Booth as *Hamlet*, not to see the play of "Hamlet"; this is a halcyon joy none of us, in our wildest imaginings, have ever expected. Occasionally we may be surprised by a more or less possible *Ophelia*, but when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have we seen the guilty queen, striving to drown the voice of conscience in the sound of feasting and revel, quivering under the heart-breaking reproaches of her murdered husband's son? When have we seen the partner of her crime in all the alternate bravado and fear of his hideous act? When have we seen *Horatio, Laertes, Rosencrantz, Guildenstern*? How can *Hamlet's* thoughts, words, deeds in relation to these characters have any meaning for us unless the actors make them the real people Shakespeare meant them to be? A well constructed play of Shakespeare is a unity. Every individual in it is connected with and dependent upon every other individual; every situation springs from or leads up to every other situation. It is a growth. What becomes of this unity when we see a fine actor in the leading part surrounded by a "support" who so distort the characters they assume as to make it painful to watch, to hear them, or even to feel that they are there? The star is perhaps a genius, or at any rate a man of talent, and a trained actor (unless he has only been foisted into his prominence by managerial speculation). What a wide, what a mournful distance lies between his finished performance and the crude and wooden impersonations of his colleagues! To understand, to appreciate, to enjoy a play it must be presented to us as a harmonious entity that we may judge of it as a whole. If the life is left out of every character but the leading one, if the illusion is broken every time anybody else speaks or moves, what impression of unity do we get? And how can we hope for anything better while actors have no opportunity of obtaining an artistic training, and often no sense of its necessity? Of course every one is not blessed with an equal amount of talent, but every one can cultivate whatever amount he does possess, with the result of doing much more acceptable work than he can otherwise possibly accomplish. Many persons may have dramatic ability in a marked degree, and, simply through lack of training, never fulfill the promise it gives. The material is there, but they do not know how to use it. In time they often become careless or indifferent, and so long as their audiences put up with inferior work they are quite easy about letting them have it. If we can make our actors realize that more is expected of them, it will stimulate them to give more. And this must be not only artistically but morally beneficial. Their self-respect will be appealed to, and they will grow jealous of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignity of their art and of their own position as its followers. The class of persons who will then enter its ranks will be better, and they will bring into the theatre with them intelligence and refinement. Will not all this tend to remove from the actor's calling the prejudice still existing against it in the minds of many provincial persons, to give him as an individual that place in the public regard to which, as a follower of one of the noblest arts in the world, he is so justly entitled? And will not *this*, in its turn, improve and purify the productions put upon the stage? Actors, imbued with a proper pride in their art and regard for their position as its disciples, will no longer consent to lend their talents to performances that are degrading to themselves and demoralizing to their audiences.

Let us train our actors—let us give them the same advantages we give to the followers of all other arts, of all other professions. Why should actors alone be expected, while still inexperienced, untaught novices, to grapple unassisted with the difficulties of their vocation? Let us give them an opportunity to equip themselves for their work—to get the dramatic education which the existing system of traveling companies certainly does not furnish. Will not this also be aiding the growth of those sweet, beautiful and high qualities of heart and soul which are possessed by all whose temperament is such as to lead and fit them to become actors? As things are the actor finds his hopes of advancement met so often by almost insurmountable obstacles that, unless he has rare talent and untiring perseverance, there is great danger of his becoming a machine; his mental, moral, and dramatic development arrested, or turned back to the drudgery of imitation.

CORA MAYNARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IRISH VOTE IN THE PENDING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

In our Presidential contests, wherein the numerical strength of the two great parties is almost evenly balanced at the polls, every agency that is calculated to effect the result is naturally a matter of keen interest and appreciation. The movement going on in what is called the "Irish vote," is now watched by the political leaders with no little anxiety. This vote, which is an important factor in all the principal States of the Union, is potent, especially in the doubtful States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. An analysis of the vote in New York State alone, in this connection, will be instructive. According to the official Legislative Manual for 1887, the total number of votes in this State, based on the census of 1875, was 1,141,462; native voters, 747,280, and naturalized voters, 394,182. In the county of Kings the native voters counted 54,452, and the naturalized voters 60,062; in New York County the native voters were 90,973, and the naturalized voters 141,179. Here we see that in 1875 the naturalized voters in New York State numbered about one-third of the total vote, and in the two principal cities of the State the naturalized voters numbered considerably more than one-half the total vote of New York and Brooklyn.

The relative strength of the naturalized vote to-day is certainly not less than it was in 1875. What proportion the Irish vote holds to the total naturalized vote in New York State can only be conjectured, but that it is very large goes without saying. With the "Irish vote" should be counted a large number of Irish-Americans born in this country, who are officially enumerated with the native voters, so that the actual political force of this element is even greater than the figures quoted would indicate; and the like is true of the Germans, though not of the Poles,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italians, or Scandinavians—elements which are in their first generation in America.

The Irish vote, as is generally known, has been until recently a solid phalanx and a cabled annex to the Democratic party, the exceptional Irish Republican to be found here and there only the more sharply denoting the rule. This may not be a cause for congratulation, but we are now in the region of practical politics and have to do with facts. That the elements constituting the Irish vote should on occasions feel called upon to express themselves distinctively respecting political measures and movements, calculated to affect interests common to them as men of the same race or religious faith, is not unnatural. In this respect the Irish are not unlike other people. But why the Irish vote should ever have been a solid vote, and why it should have been so long held as the permanent asset of the Democratic party, is a question the answer to which, if not altogether satisfactory, would form a most interesting chapter in a work devoted to the curiosities of American politics.

Any political force in this country which is organized, or held intact, on a racial or religious basis is un-American; and any solid vote which wears even the semblance of foreign complexion is intolerable. This country is not a confederation of colonies nor a conglomeration of alien clans. It is a nation, with the organic life and spirit of a nation; and it is most desirable that all the elements of our population should, as speedily as circumstances will allow, assimilate themselves to the distinctive American type. This national unity does not, of course, imply agreement in all political views. Differences there will be and must be. But American citizens ought to think and act in American affairs as Americans, and not as Irishmen, or Germans, or Englishmen. Irishmen, and Germans, and Englishmen, if they put themselves forward as such, must be regarded as foreigners, and foreigners should have nothing to do with American affairs.

I do not want to pander to vulgar prejudice. I have no respect for that loud and offensive Americanism which, whilst it assumes to be the exclusive guardian of all national interests, is itself too often the offspring of race and religious bigotry. The spurious patriotism which forever cants about the "foreigner" is itself foreign to the spirit of true Americanism. He who would deny the claims of blood is unnatural, and loyalty to the genius

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of American nationality enjoins nothing that is repugnant to nature or manhood. My contention is that Americans of Irish birth ought to be just to themselves, as they are loyal to their adopted country, and justice to themselves requires that they should, like other Americans, agree to disagree in politics. This is the right thing to do, and the right thing will be found the wise thing also.

Now, Irish-Americans were not just to themselves so long as they were a solid vote. The most intensely American element of the population, they suffered themselves to appear in a semi-alien character; loving liberty, they were made to assume an attitude of seeming hostility to the friends of human freedom; the victims of British tyranny and avarice, Irishmen in America became the strong, blind, steadfast supporters of British free trade, which laid the industries of Ireland in ruin, and forced her children to seek bread and a home beyond the sea! Into these inconsistencies they were led by a superstitious allegiance to party management.

This anomalous position which the Irish vote has held is explained, if it cannot be justified, by historical causes which are no longer operative. The "Alien Law," which was passed during the administration of John Adams, was one of those causes. That law, which enabled the President at pleasure to order any alien he might deem "dangerous" to quit the country, was aimed specially at French refugees and Irish revolutionists. It was in the year 1798. The Irish Rebellion had failed. Thomas Addis Emmet and Dr. McNevin (whose monuments now ornament the front of St. Paul's Church, Broadway), with other leaders of the United Irishmen who were confined in Fort George, Scotland, received intimation from the British Government that they would be given their freedom on condition that they would leave the British dominions never to return. The condition was accepted. Rufus King then represented the United States at the Court of St. James, and to him the Irish patriots applied for passports to America. Those passports Mr. King, who was known to sympathize with the views of President Adams, declined to grant. Mr. Adams represented the Federalist party. The party in opposition was headed by Thomas Jefferson. (Curiously enough the Jeffersonian Democracy of that day was known as the Republican party.) When Mr. Marsden, the English Under-Secretary, informed Mr. Emmet and his com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

panions of Mr. King's unwillingness that they should emigrate to the United States, the Englishman suggestively remarked: "Perhaps Mr. King does not desire to have more Republicans in America!" Mr. King's refusal, however, had quite the contrary effect, and "More Republicans in America," the offspring of his ungenerous action and the truckling policy of his master, stood up to be counted. The policy of President Adams alienated the Irish and killed the Federalist party. From that time forth the Irish vote was cast solidly with the Democracy.

Three-score and eight years roll by. Another unsuccessful rebellion is recorded in Ireland. An American citizen of Irish birth, a soldier in our own Union war, is sentenced to death in England, and goes to the scaffold protesting his innocence. He charges that he is basely betrayed and cruelly abandoned to his fate by the American minister then in England, and the official correspondence sustains the terrible charge. That minister was Charles Francis Adams, a lineal descendant of John Adams. Charles Francis Adams returns to America, is put in nomination for Governor of Massachusetts by the Democracy of that State, is voted for by Irish Democrats, and those Irishmen who vote against him are denounced as traitors!

In the fifties the spirit of Nativism swept over Massachusetts, and Gardiner, an avowed Know-Nothing, was elected Governor of the State. The Montgomery Guards, an Irish-American military body, was disbanded, and other affronts were put upon men of the Irish race and the Catholic faith. The Republican party was then in its incipiency, and as soon as it was organized Massachusetts took her place in the column of Republican States. This fact, read in the light of preceding events, prejudiced the Republican party in the minds of adopted citizens; and for years after demagogues on the Democratic stump, and to hold the Irish vote in the Democratic party, sought to identify Republicanism with Know-Nothingism—tried to make the masses believe that the Republican party was but a new cover for the old proscriptive organization. The truth is that, while the Democratic and Republican parties, as such, were then as now free from the charge of bigotry, both Democrats and Republicans were tainted more or less with Know-Nothingism, and Democrats more so. The insults offered to Catholics and Irishmen in the city of Boston were shameful, but they paled before the anti-Catholic and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-Irish outrages perpetrated in Baltimore, Louisville and New Orleans. In 1856, when the Native-American party put a national ticket in nomination, Maine cast but three per cent. of her popular vote for the Know-Nothing candidates, while Virginia cast forty-seven per cent. of her popular vote for them, and Maryland, which has been ever anti-Republican, gave to the Know-Nothing nominees its entire electoral vote. What is the spirit that has actuated *Harper's Weekly*, the *New York Times*, *Puck*, and the *Evening Post*, if it is not the Know-Nothing spirit? And this spirit, which by the genius of the American system has been exorcised out of the Republican body, now dominates the Cleveland Democracy, and sorely torments its victims.

I am not arraigning the Democratic party for its sins of commission or omission, nor do I hold it responsible for the acts or words of individuals affiliated with it. There are, as is to be expected, narrow-minded men in both parties; but the charge of bigotry against either political organization is not tenable, and Irish Democratic politicians who in the past gave currency to the fiction that one-half the American people were the sworn foes of Irishmen and Catholics were engaged in very small work, of which, it is to be hoped, those politicians are now ashamed.

With the progress of education, and in the light of the knowledge of the facts here presented, the Irish vote, once solid, is now in a state of solution. Irish-Americans of to-day are practical and inquiring. They are not to be amused by fairy tales; they ask what is the living issue of the day, and the man or the party that tries to frighten them with the ghost of Know-Nothingism insults their intelligence and will in turn receive their contempt. The issue of to-day is the Tariff. It is the American system versus the British Colonial system. The Irish instinctively are Protectionists. Nineteen-twentieths of them are workingmen, and, looking at the matter as a question of wages, they very naturally object to Free Trade. Knowing this, the Democratic politicians, from Grover Cleveland down, are at pains to make the working people believe that Free Trade is beside the issue; but Mr. Henry George and every honest free trader in the land say it is a step in that direction; and the English press, which are concerned about our national contest only in so far as the result may affect English interests, hail Cleveland's policy with cheers, and hope and pray for his success. The fact that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lion and Unicorn have taken the stump for Cleveland and Thurman is not calculated to hurt Harrison and Morton in the estimation of the Irish, who will, I promise, give a good account of themselves in the pending Presidential election.

PATRICK FORD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OPEN GATE OF DREAMLAND.

CAN a mesmerized "subject" be made unconsciously to commit murder, arson, burglarly and other crimes?

This is the grave question which has been brought into prominence by recent experiments in Europe, and which is so important to the welfare of society that students of psychical phenomena should take no rest till it is answered.

Since early school days I have been interested in the occult—in those mental phenomena and states, concerning which so little is known that they are regarded as mysterious. My attention has always been sharply arrested by the alleged causes of aphasia and heterophemy; by the marvels of clairvoyance and unconscious cerebration; by the various definitions of the Nirvana of the Hindoos; by the curious effects of hasheesh, nitrous oxide, and opium; by somnambulism and by that creative and rhythmic sleep in which Coleridge said he composed the weird poem, beginning:

> "In Xanadu did Kubla Khan
> A stately pleasure-dome decree,
> Where Alph, the sacred river, ran
> Through caverns measureless to man,
> Down to a sunless sea."

For thirty years I visited every traveling mesmerist that came along, and marveled at his experiments. After observing them under scientific conditions, and carefully eliminating Beard's "nine sources of error," I became quite certain of their genuineness, and a year or two ago began to practice upon such sensitive people as I could induce to submit to manipulations.

I did as I had seen mesmerizers do: sequestered the person as completely as possible from conversation, laughter, and the company of others; asked him to sit at perfect ease, and to close his eyes and keep them closed for some minutes. I touched his forehead with gentle pressure, then told him firmly that he could not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

open his eyes, necessarily accompanying that assurance with a strong desire that he should keep them closed.

The first success in mesmerism (or hypnotism, if the reader prefer the Greek synonym), surprised me greatly, because it did not appear that the small cause was at all adequate to the tremendous result. There was before me a sturdy man apparently helpless, apparently subject in all things to my direction and caprice, apparently unconscious of his surroundings, seeing nothing, hearing nothing, knowing nothing, not even his powerlessness in the presence of a dominant mood and purpose. There was no collusion; for I had never seen the man or he me till five minutes before. I did not know his nativity or his name, or where he lived or anything about him. I had not even been aware of "bringing my will to bear on him" in any sense other than that in which we employ it to second and enforce any desire. Yet there he sat, apparently deprived of all ability to lift his hand without my permission; and I experimented with him till I proved that the appearance was a reality, and that he was absolutely subject to my suggestion.

Right here let me say that this influence over him was cumulative and progressive. At first he was only passively responsive. I could keep him still but could not make him move. I could close his eyes, fasten his clenched hands together, prohibit his rising, prevent his speaking, and control all his muscles, but for a time could not subject him to active hallucinations through his senses.

I had mesmerized him two or three times before, becoming perfectly subjective, he entered the open gate of dreamland and saw and heard imaginary voices and sights to which I called his attention. Since that time I have similarly experimented on some dozens of ladies and gentlemen successfully, though in two or three instances I have been able only to control their muscles, and have totally failed to subvert their senses or their consciousness.

It is sometimes a long step from the loss of power over the weak and fluttering eyelid and that ludicrous loss of perception in which a roll of paper becomes a dagger, a glove becomes alternately a bird and a snake, and a broom becomes a banjo.

The various stages of mesmeric control seem to follow each other somewhat in this way: first, bewilderment and doubt; second, muscular obedience—and up to this point the responsive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is wholly or partially conscious of his identity and surroundings; third, lethargy or tendency to sleep; fourth, surrender of the senses and loss of identity; fifth, catalepsy; sixth, complete hallucination or waking dream.

The word "responsive" is used by me as a noun to designate a person who has been placed under mesmeric control—the usual word "subject" meaning too much, and being often offensive; and the word "sensitive" meaning too little, as thousands are very sensitive and susceptible to all nervous and intellectual influences who are apparently not mesmerizable.

When the Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW asked me to narrate in these pages my experiences as an amateur mesmerist, I shrunk from accepting the invitation on account of an imperfect comprehension of the causes and relations of the phenomena I had observed.

But when I reflected that mesmerism, by most minds, is still assigned to the domain of the supernatural; when I realized that the slight and fragmentary contributions of Braid, Charcot, Obersteiner, Beard, Hammond and Carpenter were so valuable and important that they had laid the foundation of a true mental philosophy; and when I glanced at the multitudinous books written on the subject, both of those who had and those who had not personal experience with mesmerism, and marked the audacious alacrity with which Campili in Italy; Gilert, La Tourette and Deleuze in France; and Bovee Dods, Durant and Gregory in England and America, had derived facts from dreams and dogmas from guesses, it seemed that a plain narrative of my observations might possibly be of service.

This inference was strengthened by the eager interest recently shown by intellectual people. The *soirées hypnotiques* in Washington have been attended and actively participated in by Secretaries Vilas and Whitney, Postmaster-General Dickinson, Gen. John C. Black, Gov. N. J. Colman, Senators Ingalls, Platt, Palmer, Jones, Spooner, Morgan and Harris, by admirals, military men, congressmen, supreme judges and authors, ladies and gentlemen who desire to know the latest word that concerns the problems of mind and the development of the race.

Besides this, the Philosophical Society of that city, the most important in the United States, I believe, has held several meetings for the investigation and elucidation of this subject, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shown a disposition to follow up discussion with original research. I am not a physician, and yet I entertain myself and friends with mesmerism; and I submit that the proclamation of Dr. Charcot, from his chair in the Salpetrière, Paris, that every laic mesmerizer ought to be prohibited by law from "meddling with this dangerous power," is somewhat cooler than Nova Zembla, in view of the fact that a great layman, Mesmer, first brought it to the attention of mankind, and was hooted, derided, persecuted, robbed, and driven into exile and poverty by the bigoted guild of which Dr. Charcot is so illustrious a member. This is a prohibition that will not prohibit.

In this article I ignore what may be called the mystic side of mesmerism. Of that I know nothing. Of the alleged "magnetic fluid," or sublimated effluence which Mesmer, Deleuze, and most mesmerists have believed in as an agency necessary to effect their purpose; the presence of Gregory's "odyllic light"; of the potency of the magnet; of clairvoyance, enabling the responsive to read books he cannot see and describe scenes he has never visited; of Fechner's "material soul"; of thought-transference, enabling the operator to convey his ideas to the mind of the responsive by a mere effort of the will; of the transfer of disease to the mesmerizer; of Dods' theory of "negative blood and positive lungs"; of the power of the magnetic tub and the shining button; of Durant's "polarity of man" and the transposition of molecules; of these mysterious influences and occurrences I have no knowledge. My own experiments have not revealed any of them, and, failing to do so, have suggested that they may all be delusions arising from the practice of the deductive rather than the inductive method.

Mesmerism, like natural sleep, is a state of being thrown out of harmony with environments. It is thus akin to lunacy. Every man is mesmerized once a day—self-mesmerized when he goes to sleep—but the hallucinations are not usually expressed, much less acted out with dramatic intensity, as in this curious imposed trance. Many believe that mesmerism has its source in spiritualism, and that the entranced person actually sees the forms and hears the voices of departed human beings. I have never had the least evidence tending to justify any such conclusion. There seems to be nothing in hypnotic hallucinations showing whether man is an angel or a clod, whether he is an in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destructible soul waiting for release from his cage to soar like a bird to the stars and live forever, or merely the transitory crown of earth's fauna, struggling with the hopeless problems of his destiny between ice-age and ice-age.

Mesmerism is always the result of suggestion, and is never effected in any other way. If I face a responsive to the wall I can have no effect upon him unless I speak to him. If he is beyond my reach I cannot affect him at all without communicating with him. I believe it is exactly true to say that no wish of a mesmerist ever effected a responsive until that wish was conveyed to him through the senses. Mesmerism is the result of expectant attention. No concentration of the mesmerizer's will without the knowledge of the responsive is followed by any result. Dr. Gilert, in France, has written a good deal and told many marvelous stories about "*sommeil à distance,*" but I have never been able to obtain any such results under the most favorable conditions. I have mesmerized a good many without touching them, by merely waving my hand, or speaking to them, and I have several times put absent responsives into a sound sleep by writing or telegraphing to them that they would fall into a mesmeric sleep at a certain hour, and this has happened sometimes to their inconvenience. But the sleep was the result of a conspiracy between expectation and acquiescence. If they had not known what I wished, I might have sat in my library and wished till the next century without any response whatever.

For the benefit of those who may desire to experiment, here are certain conclusions derived from my own observations:

I. About one person in ten can be easily mesmerized. There are no known rules by which to pick out this mesmerizable person in advance, as eligibility extends almost impartially to both sexes and all ages, to blondes and brunettes, and people of all temperaments, to rich and poor, to learned and unlettered, and, it may be added, to obstinate and docile. Professor Carpenter, a most successful expert, thinks that employés are a little more tractable than employers, and those under twenty than those over twenty; but his conclusion may have resulted from the obvious fact that young employés would be more likely to respond to an invitation from the manipulator to "come forward" than would those of a higher social position, who might see in it a sacrifice of dignity or a loss of consideration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. The proportion of people who have the "power" to mesmerize, if it be a power, is still more problematical. But it seems to me what might be called a biological axiom, that no human being possesses any quality different in kind from that possessed, in various degrees, by all other human beings.

III. Mesmerism is a trance, artificially produced, and it appears almost identical with somnambulism, or active sleep.

IV. This artificial sleep, if unaccompanied by exciting episodes, is as harmless as natural sleep. My responsives occasionally come to me in the daytime to be put to sleep for the purpose of obtaining needed rest.

V. If a mesmerized person be left to himself, the mesmeric sleep will, in the course of a few hours, pass into normal sleep, from which he will, in due time, awake refreshed.

VI. Hallucinations that take place under mesmerism are seldom remembered in a subsequent waking state, but they are generally recalled vividly in a subsequent mesmeric state.

VII. The exception to this is that exciting scenes into which responsives are thrown are often recalled after they are awakened. Imaginary shipwrecks and conflagrations are generally thus recalled; and a young lady who, while in a mesmeric trance, was taken where she could scrape up her handkerchief full of imaginary diamonds, sighed deeply on coming to herself, and exclaimed: "Ah! where are the splendid diamonds?"

VIII. Somnambulists are apt to be mesmerizable, and, among responsives, I find those who usually remember their dreams in the morning also recall a larger proportion of trance experiences that those who habitually forget their dreams.

IX. Mesmerized sensitives do not see any of the objects or people in the room except the operator, or hear anything except his voice. They can be made apparently cognizant of their surroundings only by having their attention explicitly called to them by the operator. Even then they generally see imaginary objects only. Their eyes are open and their sight appears to an oculist entirely normal, but there is no co-ordination of the faculties. If I introduce "a gentleman," they treat him as such; if I introduce him as "a young person," they wonder whether he is a boy or a girl, and are liable to address him as either.

X. It is conceivable that mesmerism might injure an invalid. If he have heart disease, for instance, an exciting or violent ep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

isode, a rapture of joy or a convulsion of great grief or fear, might prove injurious or even fatal, just as it might in his normal condition.

XI. This possibility is abundantly offset by the value of mesmerism as a therapeutic agent. The responsive can be made so intoxicated on water, which he has been told is whisky, as to exhibit all symptoms of extreme inebriety; can be made disgustingly seasick by being told that he is at sea in a storm; and can be at once physically affected by any imaginary medicine. His temperature can be changed, his eye dilated, and his pulse quickened. Mesmerism is as perfect an anæsthetic as ether, and as harmless as water. Any mesmerized person can at once, by a single stroke of the hand, be rendered totally insensible to pain, and can have a tooth drawn, a cataract removed, a cancer cut out, or an arm cut off without feeling the slightest pain. This has been so often demonstrated that amputations frequently take place under its influence in the Paris hospitals, and it is successfully employed in obstetrics. Though only a fraction of patients will be found eligible as candidates for this annihilator of pain, its utility is so obvious it cannot be long before medical societies will take up the therepeusis of mesmerism as a serious study, and army surgeons will be required to have as practical a knowledge of it as of any part of the pharmacopæia.

XII. It is quite erroneous to suppose that the conduct of the responsive is directed in detail by the operator. He only suggests the general line of thought, and each responsive pursues it according to his own knowledge, experience or prejudices. I say to my responsives, for instance, that I have a wonderful educated cow with seven heads. They all want to see it. I call their attention to the imaginary stable-door near by; they look towards it, and, when I snap my fingers, they all see a seven-headed cow enter. Now, by questioning them, it becomes obvious that they all see a different cow. Unless I have designated her color, one sees a white cow, another a red cow, and so on.

Then I tell them that she can dance—can waltz and keep time with music. I hand one a cane telling him it is a flute and that he is an eminent performer, and he goes through the motions of playing to the dancing cow. They all hear different tunes, but the exhibition is satisfactory. I now add that the cow can sing—can sing a different part with each mouth—can sing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seven ballads at once. At this point there is perhaps some incredulity expressed. They see the cow stand up on her hind legs and hear the seven ballads—and this, I may as well add, is the narrative of an actual experiment.

Five of the six mesmerized persons believed that she sang. "She is singing 'Tit Willow,'" said one. "And 'A Warrior Bold,'" said another.

"I hear singing," said the incredulous one turning to me. "'Annie Laurie,' isn't it? How do you work her?—the machinery, I mean?"

The others laughed at him. "Why, the cow sings," said a young lady. "Can't you hear her sing? Can't you see her sing?"

"She looks as if she sang," conceded Incredulous. "I see her mouths move all around. She sounds as if she sang; but she doesn't sing. Cows don't sing."

"Very well, what is it then?" asked one of the others.

"A tube and a hole in the floor," said Incredulous, "or perhaps ventriloquism."

"Aw!" exclaimed the first, derisively, "ventriloquism does not work like that. I've made a study of ventriloquism."

"Well, I've made a study of Cow!" persisted the scoffer obstinately.

Sometimes I turn the responsives into children, and have them play school with infinite fun; sometimes transport them over ocean to Africa or Japan on the enchanted carpet, where for a brief space they enjoy all the delights of travel; sometimes we participate in battles, in political campaigns, in exciting tirade, and sometimes Socrates, Moses, or Confucius is introduced and interviewed, the intelligent responsive furnishing both questions and answers in a curious dual action of the mind that is highly entertaining.

Not only the reason sometimes rebels as above, but the conscience also.

As a rule responsives can be completely dominated and made to do anything of which they are physically capable. They could generally be induced to take poison, or jump off the house, or throw themselves under a locomotive, or attack one another with deadly weapons. But there are some exceptions. I was unable to overcome the fear of one of my responsives, whom I sent to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assault an imaginary Indian in the Park. He refused to go, and said it was "difficult to kill an Indian."

A young lady, one of the brightest sensitives I have ever seen, steadfastly refuses to play cards. I tell her she is Buffalo Bill and easily induce her to assume his character, but when cards are suggested, "No, I never play cards. It is wrong!" she says, and I cannot move her. I could make her jump out through the window or put her hand in the fire, but play cards she will not. I was puzzled by it till inquiring, I ascertained that her religious parents had brought her up very strictly, and taught her it was "wicked to play cards."

And this brings us to the question much mooted of late, whether crime can be committed by the aid of mesmerism. If so, it is brought into relations, not only with medicine, but with jurisprudence—not only with the pharmacopæia but the penitentiary. It is obvious that, if cases of this kind occur, the one to whom punishment must be dealt out is the mesmerist.

I have no doubt that crimes of a certain sort can be thus committed. It is obvious that sexual offenses could easily take place without the acquiescence or conscious concurrence of the responsive; and it is alleged that aggressions of this kind have attracted the attention of the authorities in France. Crimes against life and property by the agency of the responsives, being more complicated, would be more difficult and proportionately less frequent. Deep interest has been challenged by the allegation that a young girl in Paris, whose lover had become tired of her, was mesmerized by him and sent twenty-five miles away on the cars and there, influenced by his previously communicated suggestion, induced to commit suicide with a pistol. If such a power exists it is indeed not only startling, but greatly alarming. The question is, does it exist? Did it exist and operate in this instance, or did the suicide result from some other prompting; for instance, the knowledge of the girl that her lover wished that she was dead.

It would be easy to mesmerize a lady and send her into a cage of lions with their trainer, as was done in Paris, but, as the lions would not be mesmerized, and would therefore seem liable to attack her, it would be a cruel and dangerous thing to do.

As to the young lady's suicide under such prompting, I doubt it. The act implies a coherence of thought and continuity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

motive that mesmerized sensations do not seem to possess. I could probably induce any one of my responsives to take his life in my presence, or to assault anybody within reach, but the mind wanders curiously in this strange condition, and generally takes little cognizance of surrounding objects. I have used the word "probably" in this sentence because the conduct of mesmerized persons cannot be positively predicted. The mental impression may not, in a given case, be sufficiently vivid and dominating to induce action, or the intention may be counteracted by the trained moral sense asserting itself and overbalancing the confused hypnotic tendency.

I have had a notary public administer an oath to some of the ladies and gentlemen whom I mesmerized, and they committed perjury without hesitation. I have had some of them assault imaginary persons in the street and set fire to imaginary dwellings. But if I had sent them to commit a real assault or real arson, the chances are that both would have been unsuccessful attempts.

One evening I told one of my most alert responsives to go and rob the house immediately adjoining mine—opening, indeed, upon the same lawn. I told him it was daylight and all the people were away; that the door was unlocked and a great pile of gold lay in the middle of the second floor front; and I described the hall and stairway. He entered with apparent zest into the scheme, and taking an imaginary bag which I handed him, started to commit the crime. But, though his eyes were open, he walked straight against the wall of the drawing room without seeing it. I gave him new direction and he walked into the bay-window and would have walked through it, had I not stopped him. I led him to the door, where he went out and fell down the steps. He did not find the next house at all.

He saw nothing but his ideal realm—the world of transient hallucinations in which he dwelt. A mesmerized person cannot usually see even a chair to sit in unless his attention is especially called to it. He sees nobody and nothing but the mesmerist and the other mesmerized persons with whom he is *en rapport*. He is in a state of somnambulistic coma, and his fancies are insane delusions bearing no relation to the actual things around. Mesmerized sensitives are bewildered and helpless when away from the mesmerizer, and I have seldom seen one who was sufficiently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-controlled to go even one hundred feet away from me and do anything that he was told to do.

One evening at a reception, a curious thing happened. I transported a young man and two ladies to Paris on the magic carpet, and left them enjoying and commenting on the pictures in the Louvre while I turned aside to superintend a personation of the President by another. When I returned to the tourists they had absolutely forgotten me, and I could not in any way make my presence known to them. They did not see my face or hear my voice, but continued their absorbed enjoyment of the great art galleries. I was compelled to unmesmerize them and start again from the beginning.

This same young man proved an expert penman. I filled out a check on the Lincoln Bank of New York City with the sum of $100,000, and then, producing a genuine signature of Cornelius Vanderbilt, I induced him to imitate it with great accuracy in a signature at the bottom of the check, my arrangement with him being that he should have one-half of it when collected. I suggested that I would collect it and then rejoin him; but he was too shrewd and suspicious for that, and insisted on accompanying me to the imaginary bank, informing me, with more than the unction of Sairey Gamp, that he would "knock my head off" if I did not "divvy square." I do not see why a depredating mesmerist might not thus make use of an innocent accessory to complete a felony.

At another reception I was more successful in the matter of burglary. I made private arrangements beforehand with a neighbor half a block off, who concealed a plethoric pocket-book in a bureau drawer upstairs, then locked the bureau, the room and the house, and brought me the three keys. When I had mesmerized my agent I told him he was the famous robber, Dick Turpin, and that I had a job for him. I called his attention to the fact that he was on the earth and must look out where he stepped. I told him where the house was, and described it minutely. I made a diagram of the interior, of the stairs, the room, and the bureau, gave him the keys, and introduced to him a "pal" who would keep watch. He asked if there were any dogs. I reassured him on this point, gave him an imaginary revolver, and started him off. I requested some gentlemen to follow him, to see that no harm befell him, among whom were General Greely, Senator Kenna, and W. E. Curtis, the well-known journalist.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He went to the house, skirmished slyly about it, and finally unlocked the door, groped his way up the front stairs, unlocked the room and the bureau and got the wallet. Then he began to exceed his instructions by plundering the house. His accomplice argued the matter with him, and finally induced him to desist from his purpose and start to return. But, when once on the street, he resolved to run away and enjoy the whole of the booty himself. "What's the use going back to divide?" he petulantly asked. Only after another argument and some show of force was he got back to my house. He came in noiselessly, but with triumphant air, and demanded three-quarters of the spoil, which I gave him on the spot—at least, to his satisfaction. He left the bureau open, but locked the doors on leaving. On being restored to himself, he knew nothing of his adventure.

So it seems obvious to me that burglaries at a little distance can be committed under the most favorable circumstances by the employment of an innocent agent, who is quite unconscious of any violation of law or of equity. There are strict limitations to this power of vicarious crime, but the possibility that it may occur should be enough to excite the solicitude of neurologists on the one hand, and the attention of jurists on the other.

One of Charcot's disciples in France, Dr. Luys, has experimented with medicines with hypnotic patients, and has caused much excitement by his proclamation that medicines would operate without being administered at all. He declares that a corked vial of laudanum laid upon a patient's neck induced sleep, although the patient did not know what it was; that a vial of valerian, similarly brought in contact with the person, was followed by deep dejection; that hasheesh caused hilarity and buoyancy, etc. I have repeated these experiments, but do not obtain any of the alleged results. If the responsive does not know what is said to be in the vial, no result whatever follows; and if he knows or believes some particular medicine to be in the vial, and knows the effects which follow the use of that medicine, he will have those external symptoms, whether that medicine be actually there or not. Hypnotic hallucinations are the result of an all-absorbing expectation. If the responsive thinks he is drinking too much whisky, he will become helplessly inebriated; if he thinks he is at sea in a storm, he will be afflicted with violent nausea, enough to convince any skeptic of the genu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ineness of the emotion; if he thinks he has swallowed laudanum, he will fall into a sleep. How far this delusion will go in physical repairing or impairing, I do not know; but I should not like to give a gum drop to the most sensitive of mesmerized ladies and afterwards tell her that she had swallowed strychnine.

Nine-tenths of the readers of this article will say, "Nobody can mesmerize me!" This is the innocent and foolish prattle of a child in presence of an unknown force. Only experiment can demonstrate whether a particular person can be easily mesmerized or not. If he can be, it implies no weakness of nerves or of brain, no mental or physical inferiority of any sort. If he cannot be, it does not prove strength of intellect or even of will, or the possession of any superior qualities of mind or body.

"How do you know these persons are not deceiving you?" is a question often asked. They might deceive me for a few minutes or an hour, but not for months. In the first place they are not persons who would indulge in such folly. In their normal condition they are quite incapable of the long and elaborate speeches and earnest dramatic performances which they give. They are thrown into cataleptic rigidity, whose genuineness is attested by physicians. While insensitive they are subjected to great pain, which they could not bear in their normal state. They can be made to laugh immoderately or weep at will.

I have seen a young man, while making a speech, deliberately and deeply seared down the hand with a white-hot iron, quite unexpectedly to himself, and he showed no sign of being conscious of it. I have seen a mesmerized man, driven to despair by the suggestions of the operator (Dr. George M. Beard), seize a revolver, which he could not have known was unloaded, utter a frantic prayer, aim the weapon at his heart and fire, dropping to the floor an inert mass. He recovered after a while, but it was a perilous experiment. In a hundred ways I know I am not deceived, and that these phenomena are genuine and all significant.

That they have been so long treated with supercilious derision by the learned, surrendered to traveling showmen and exploiting laymen, neglected even when not rejected, and left to make their way, like the truths of all revelations, by "the mouths of babes and sucklings," is the irony of science and the reproach even of that variegated empiricism which calls itself "the medical profession."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will be observed that in this paper no attempt has been made to explain the phenomena described. There is a wide domain of psychological life of which we are vaguely cognizant, whose remote frontiers have only just been reached by scientific research. Its soil cannot be analyzed by chemists, or its products weighed with grocer's scales, or its area measured with compass and chain, and if we are ever to know more of the great mysteries which lie within its strange precincts, it must be by means of an earnest and thorough exploration with new methods by scientific men, and a careful collation of observed facts. It is in this spirit and with this hope that I present this chronicle.

W. A. CROFFUT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR CHIEF JUSTICES OFF THE BENCH.

THE death of Judge Waite shows how little the world knows of our Supreme Court judges outside of their gowns. The austerity of the bench shrouds from the public their delightful personal traits, and the facts that Chief Justice Marshall liked novels,—that John Jay smoked clay pipes,—that Oliver Ellsworth would rather romp with children than write judicial opinions—make interesting the study of the Chief Justices of the United States as men. In this article I propose to look at our Chief Justices off the bench, and to give the reader some stories and pictures of their private lives. The first of them was John Jay, and you may see his kind face shining out of the scarlet-gowned portrait of him in the Supreme Court chamber.

He was one of the ablest of the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court. In the words of Daniel Webster, "when the spotless ermine of the judicial robe fell upon him it touched nothing less spotless than itself."

His pictures represent him as a man of almost classic features. His forehead is broad, high and full; his nose large and inclined to the Roman; his chin pointed; his mouth firm, but pleasant, and his eyes large, bright, blue and sparkling. His long hair is combed back in waves from his face. It is slightly powdered, and it forms a queue at the back. The face is one of culture, dignity and intelligence, and John Jay possessed these qualities in a remarkable degree.

The son of Peter Jay, a rich merchant of New York, he came from one of the oldest families of Holland, and he had in him the blood of the Bayards. He was well educated. His first schooling was under a Mr. Stoop, a French clergyman, who had a shrewish wife of penurious habits. Young Jay boarded with Mr. Stoop, and it is said that he was often obliged to protect his bed from the drifting snow, and to close up the broken panes with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bits of wood. He was a fine talker, and his oratory was secured by much the same methods as was that of Demosthenes. He could not pronounce distinctly, and he had a faulty pronunciation of the letter L. He devoted himself during his college days to the study of the rules of elocution, and, by continued exercise, clarified his tones and made his pronunciation perfect. He was a hard student, and he paid especial attention to English composition, adopting Pope's plan of keeping by his bedside a table supplied with writing materials in order that he might write down such ideas as occurred to him in waking during the night.

Some good stories are told of his college days, and at one time some of his classmates broke a table in the college hall. The professors could not identify the offender. They called the class together and, beginning at the head, asked each student two questions. The first one was as to whether the boy had broken the table. The second was as to whether he knew who did. All of the students except Jay and one other young man replied "no" to both questions. Jay replied that he had not broken the table, but that he knew the offender, but would not tell his name. The same reply was made by Jay's friend. The professors were angry, and they expelled both students. They were afterwards taken back, however, and Jay graduated with the highest honors.

He at once began his legal studies, and that in the office of Mr. Benjamin Kissam, one of the then noted lawyers of New York. After he was admitted to the bar he was employed in a number of cases in which Kissam was the lawyer for the opposite side. One day, when Jay in argument pushed Kissam very hard, the latter said, pointing to Jay :

"Here I have brought up a bird to pick out my own eyes !"

"Not to pick out your eyes," replied young Jay instantly, "but to open your eyes, Mr. Kissam !" And of course the Court laughed.

Jay had acquired a good practice at the opening of the Revolution, but he left it for the service of his country, and the greater part of the remainder of his life was taken up by his various public positions.

He did well in every one of them, and as Minister to Spain he secured loans upon his own credit which the Government could never have secured otherwise. When he returned he was given the freedom of New York in a gold box at a public reception there,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and as Secretary of State he practically organized the foreign relations of the Government. When Washington became President he was invited to select his own post, and he chose the Chief Justiceship of the Supreme Court. He resigned to be Minister to England, where he made the Jay Treaty which was so unpopular nearly one hundred years ago; and after he came back to this country he was made Governor of New York and was re-elected. He then decided to retire to private life, and he declined the office of Chief Justice, which was again offered to him. He was at this time only fifty-six years old, and he had for twenty-seven years served in every department of legislative, diplomatic and judicial trust.

He had built a house at Bedford, about forty-four miles from New York City, and he had here an estate of eight hundred acres, which had come to him by inheritance. To this he retired, and here he spent his last days. Seven hundred of these eight hundred acres are now in the hands of his grandchildren, and the old house is still filled with relics of John Jay. The house was altered somewhat in 1860, but its old features were preserved, and it is practically the same as when the ex-Chief Justice occupied it. It has fine old elms lining the roads leading to it, and the dwelling is one hundred feet long, and it has a hall eight feet wide running through its centre. It is of two stories and an attic, and it contains many large and comfortable rooms. In the library are John Jay's table and chair which he used as Chief Justice; on its mantel are his Spanish pistols, and on its walls hang engraved portraits and a painting of him by Gabriel Stuart.

Here John Jay spent the last twenty-five years of his life, and his method of living would form a good example to the old men of to-day. Like most of our old statesmen, Washington, Jefferson and John Adams, he was perfectly regular in his habits. He rose at dawn, and in order that he might get the first rays of the sun, a hole in the form of a crescent was cut in the solid oaken shutter of his bed-room. As soon as the rays touched his eyes he awoke. He had prayers before breakfast, and he spent most of the day in attending to his farm. He was very fond of animals, and during the busiest days of his diplomatic missions abroad he had time to write to his family in regard to his old sorrel mare, as follows:

"If my old mare is alive, I must beg of you and my brother to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take good care of her. I mean she should be well fed and left idle, unless my brother Peter should choose to use her. If it should be necessary to advance money to recover her, I am content that you should do it, even to the amount of double her value."

John Jay took his dinner at half-past one, and was wont to smoke a pipe or two of tobacco after it. He was fond of a long clay pipe, and he had his pipes imported from England. He devoted a great part of his last days to literary and scientific investigations. He was a good writer, and wrote several of the Federalist papers.

He died on the 17th of May, 1829, and, according to his own desire, his funeral was as simple as possible. Had cremation been then in fashion he would probably have been cremated. He would not have himself deposited in the family vault, and he said he considered it heathenish to try to keep the relics of mortality from that dissolution which God has intended for them. He judged that $200 would be saved by the simplicity of his funeral, and shortly before he died he had this amount of silver money counted out before him, and directed that it should be given to some poor and worthy widow of the neighborhood. This his children did after his death.

The second Chief Justice of the United States held the rank only by appointment. He never took his seat upon the bench as Chief Justice, and sickness deranged his mind, and he died insane. This man's name was John Rutledge, who was nominated by Washington on the resignation of John Jay. He was born in South Carolina, and he studied law in the Temple in London. He gained the highest rank at the Bar, and he was President and Commander-in-Chief of the Colony of South Carolina, 1776. He was an Associate Judge of the Supreme Court when the Jay Treaty was announced, and he made a violent speech against it just two days before his appointment as Chief Justice reached him, and in this he denounced the leaders of the Federal party, and it was on this ground that the Senate refused to confirm his nomination. The mortification at this rejection was, it is said, one of the causes of his insanity.

There was much more dignity about the Supreme Court in the days of Washington than there is now. Chief Justice Jay wore a black gown with scarlet facings, and William Cushing, the man who was appointed his successor, never appeared without a wig.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Massachusetts before he was made Associate Justice of the United States, and Flanders, to whom I am much indebted in this article,* tells a story of the sensation which his wig created when he came to New York to take his seat on the Supreme Bench. It was in February, 1790, and it seems that wigs were not then common among the New York judges. When Cushing appeared on Broadway, he noticed that a hundred boys followed him as though he were the prize elephant of a circus procession. The boys did not cry at him, but their number was augmented at every step. Judge Cushing was at a loss to know the reason of their attention, when a sailor who passed by looked at him and involuntarily exclaimed:

"My eyes! What a wig!"

This disgusted the new Supreme Court judge, and he went to a barber and had his hair arranged in the ordinary style of the day.

In that day the judges of the Supreme Court wore black silk stockings, knee-breeches and buckled shoes. The colonial judges before them were even more gorgeous, and their black silk gowns were worn over full black suits, with white bands at the neck, and they had silk bags for their hair. These judges, when murderers were being tried, wore scarlet robes with black velvet collars and with black velvet facings.

Judge Cushing was unanimously confirmed as Chief Justice of the United States, but he resigned the position without taking his seat. This was on account of ill-health, though he continued on the Supreme Bench as an Associate Judge until he died, fifteen years later. The story of his appointment is worth telling. Jay was absent in England, negotiating the Jay Treaty, and Cushing was presiding over the bench in his stead. One evening at a diplomatic dinner, when the guests were about to be seated, President Washington turned toward Judge Cushing and said: "The Chief Justice of the United States will please take his place at my right."

He received his commission the next day, but only held the place for about a week. He was a man of strong mind, though slow, and it was once said that though Judge Cushing had fine ideas in his head, it required a beetle and a wedge to get them out.

* Flanders' Lives and Times of the Chief Justices.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was a fair-complexioned, blue-eyed, aquiline-nosed man, tall and graceful. Like all of the judges, he possessed domestic traits. His wife went with him on his circuits, and she read aloud to him while they rode in the phaeton from one place to another.

The next Chief Justice was Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and he was one of the most remarkable men who have ever held a seat on the Supreme Bench. Beginning his practice after graduating at Princeton and studying law, during his first three years his fees did not average three pounds of Connecticut money per annum. He had settled on a farm within about ten miles from Hartford, and when court was in session he walked in every morning and out every night. Nevertheless, a year or so later, Noah Webster, the author of the Dictionary, who studied law with him, said that he had then one of the largest practices in New England, and that he had from one thousand to fifteen hundred cases on his books all the time.

Ellsworth was a hard student, and his father designed him for a minister. He did not get along well, however, at Yale, and afterwards went to Princeton. He was a real college boy in his actions, and delighted to defy the professors. At one time the students were prohibited from wearing their hats within the college yard. Ellsworth was called before the faculty for violating this rule. He made his own defense, and this was that a hat, as defined by the dictionaries, was composed of two parts, the crown and the brim. He had torn the brim off of his hat, and had only worn the crown. As his head covering had no brim it could not be called a hat, and hence he was not guilty. His defense was so ingenious that the faculty let him off without punishment.

Shortly after he graduated his father found that he was not cut out for a preacher, and allowed him to study law. He began the study in debt, and during the first part of his law studies he cut wood enough to release himself from his obligations. He was at the head of the Connecticut bar before he entered politics, and he was one of the most remarkable politicians of his day. It was of him, while he was in the Senate, that Aaron Burr said that "if Oliver Ellsworth brought in a resolution in which was the name of God, and he should spell the name with two d's, it would take the Senate three weeks to consider as to whether they could rightly expunge the extra letter!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was a very efficient foreign minister, and he made one of the ablest of our Chief Justices. His greatness was largely the result of hard work. He was once asked as to the secret of his intellectual power, and he replied that early in his life he discovered that he had no imagination. He analyzed his mind and found that its qualities were such that he was greatly disappointed and discouraged. He determined to study one subject at a time, and not to abandon it until it was fully mastered. He said that his success in his profession came, he thought, from his having given his attention to the main points of a case and leaving the minor ones to shift for themselves.

Ellsworth was a man of strong memory, and he had great power of concentration of mind. At times, when he had an important matter to consider, he would retire to his lodgings and walk up and down the floor, unconcious of anything except the matter about which he was thinking. During this time his lips would be in constant motion, and an indistinct utterance would be kept up until he arrived at his conclusions. He was addicted to snuff-taking, and at these times, says one of his friends, he would take, on the average, a pinch of snuff per minute, but the moment he arrived at a conclusion his mind seemed to find instant relief. He dismissed the subject and gave himself up to amusement.

Oliver Ellsworth was a fine-looking man. Tall and commanding, he was dignified without being haughty. His countenance was grave and serious, his forehead was high and broad, and his eyes blue and penetrating. His features were regular but not handsome. He was modest and unassuming, and extremely sociable in his nature. He was a good talker, and he often became so interested in his conversation at the tea-table that he would take cup after cup of his favorite beverage without apparently noticing the number he was taking.

He was especially fond of children, and after his hardest work upon his cases he delighted in amusing himself with them. In his early life, when he was going through his hardest studies, he daily spent some time in caressing his neighbors' children, and was disappointed when any circumstance prevented this accustomed intercourse. He liked to have his children in his study, and he drew pictures for them. He kept his heart young until he died, and this was on the 26th of November, 1807, when he was sixty-three years old.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Referring to his dignity, he was the chief of the justices, as well as Chief Justice. He did not allow the other judges of the court to browbeat him, and he appreciated his own prerogatives. At one time, while he was holding court at Philadelphia, Judge Chase was associated with him, and Chase undertook to tell one of the lawyers again and again that he need not discuss certain points, as the Court very well understood and had settled these points without argument. The lawyer, after he had been interrupted for the third time, became angry, abandoned his argument, and took his seat. Chief Justice Ellsworth pulled out his snuff-box, took a pinch, and with a withering look at Judge Chase, said:

"The Court, sir, has expressed no opinion on these points, and when it does you will hear from the proper organ of the Court. You will please proceed with your argument, and I can assure you you will not be interrupted again." It is unnecessary to say that Judge Chase subsided.

Ellsworth resigned his seat on the Supreme Bench while he was in France as Minister, and did so on the ground of ill-health.

Chief Justice Marshall is remembered principally by his connection with the Supreme Court, while Oliver Ellsworth has more rank for his political services. Nevertheless, Marshall had a long political career before he became Chief Justice. He had been Ambassador to France, and he was, I think, one of those envoys who form a part of the X Y Z scandal of the last days of the last century. During this time, Talleyrand and the French Government tried to get a bribe of the American Ministers in payment for a treaty which was to be made with the United States. They failed, however, and their attempt forms one of the most scandalous pages in the history of French diplomacy in regard to the United States.

John Marshall was Secretary of State in John Adams's Cabinet, and when Chief Justice Ellsworth resigned, and Jay refused to again take the position, President Adams appointed Marshall. Marshall was at this time forty-five years old. He was tall, meagre, and emaciated, and one authority says that his joints were so loosely connected as to make him appear disqualified for any exertion of the body. He was a shambling, awkward man, careless of his dress, as a description of the time states, as far removed from the graces of Lord Chesterfield as any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other man on earth. His head and face were small in proportion to his height, and he looked older than he was.

Other descriptions tell a somewhat different story, but none pronounce Marshall handsome. Judge Story says that he was dignified, though plain, and that his dress was very simple, but very neat. He says that he had small, black, twinkling eyes, a low forehead, but harmonious features. He was a good laugher, and was full of humor. Daniel Webster said, while he was a Member of Congress, that he had never seen a man of whose intellect he had a higher opinion than of that of Judge Marshall.

As for Marshall's physical abilities, his form, though it may have been awkward, was certainly strong. He was fond of muscular exercises, and he was one of the best quoit players of his day. He was a member of the Quoit Club of Richmond for more than forty years, and even in his old age he could hurl his iron ring of two pounds weight fifty-five or sixty feet, and rarely missed the peg. When he made a good throw it is said that he jumped up and down and clapped his hands like a boy. He took off his coat to throw quoits, and he kept up the simplicity of his ways to the last.

As Chief Justice he usually wore blue mixed woolen stockings and a suit of black of very ordinary quality. He did his own marketing, and the story has often been told of how a young gentleman, finding no servants at the market to carry home his turkey, was swearing about the matter, when Marshall, who was rather a rusty-looking old gentleman, offered to take it home for him, and did so. The story is also well known of how he was taken for an old farmer by a lot of young men at a country tavern, and guyed by them until he astonished them with several hours of eloquence on the Christian religion. And another well-known story is that of one of his first law cases, how, attired in a plain linen roundabout and shorts, and with a hat-full of cherries in his hand, he took the place of a missing lawyer and surprised the Richmond bar.

These instances are very good types of his life-actions. He was absolutely simple in all his ways, and the greatness of his mind did not affect the style of his clothes. He was a man of good education, and he possessed much literary ability. His "Life of Washington" was too large to be generally read, and I doubt whether it brought him in the $150,000 which he expected to make out of it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judge Marshall was very fond of the classics, and it is said that at the age of twelve he had transcribed the whole of Pope's Essay on Man. He was very fond of Milton, Shakespeare and Dryden, and he attempted poetry himself. During his latter years he read novels with intense interest, and he would sometimes sit up all night to finish one.

He had a high admiration for the talents of the other sex, and the most beautiful stories of his life are those connected with his wife. He met her when she was but fourteen years old, and it was a case of love at first sight. On his marriage, after paying the minister his fee, his sole remaining fortune was a guinea, and this recalls the fact that Chief Justice Oliver Ellsworth was married before he ever had a case, and that the married relations of all the Chief Justices have been of the most pleasant character.

Mrs. John Jay was one of the most beautiful women of her time. She was the daughter of Governor Livingstone, and she married Jay at the age of eighteen. She went with him to Spain, and during her residence at Paris she was a great favorite in society.

The wife of Chief Justice Marshall died some years before him, and he felt her loss very deeply. It is said that he rarely passed through a night after her death without weeping for her, and he wrote, on Christmas night, 1832, one of the most affecting of tributes to her memory. This was the first anniversary of her death. Among other things he says:

"This day of joy and festivity to the whole Christian world is, to my sad heart, the anniversary of the keenest affliction which humanity can sustain. While all around is gladness my mind dwells on the silent tomb, and cherishes the remembrance of the beloved object which it contains. Never can I cease to feel the loss, and to deplore it. Grief for her is too sacred ever to be profaned on this day, which shall be, during my existence, marked by a recollection of her virtues."

Here follows a long paragraph of eulogy of Mrs. Marshall, and he concludes his tribute as follows:

"I have lost her, and with her have lost the solace of my life! Yet she remains still the champion of my retired hours, still she occupies my inmost bosom. When alone, and unemployed, my mind still recurs to her. More than a thousand times, since the 25th of December, have I repeated to myself the beautiful lines

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

written by General Burgoyne, under a similar affliction, substituting 'Mary' for 'Anna.'

"'Encompassed in an angel's frame,
An angel's virtues lay;
Too soon did Heaven assert its claim,
And take its own away!
My Mary's worth, my Mary's charms,
Can never more return!
What now shall fill these widowed arms?
Ah me! My Mary's urn!
Ah me! ah me! My Mary's urn!'"

Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, Judge Marshall's successor, was, perhaps, the most unpopular of the Chief Justices. He came into office in trouble, and his actions in regard to the Dred Scott decision cast a gloom over his last years. He was born in Calvert County, Maryland, about one year after the Declaration of Independence, and he was admitted to practice during the year that Washington died. He was one of the most noted of Maryland lawyers, and President Jackson appointed him Attorney-General of the United States, and he was in Jackson's Cabinet when his trouble began. It arose through the United States Bank. Jackson requested his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Duane, to remove the deposits. But Duane refused to comply with this request. Jackson then removed Duane, and he sent into the Senate the name of Mr. Taney as Secretary of the Treasury. In the meantime, Taney took possession of the office, and, according to his order, the deposits were removed. The Senate, however, refused to confirm his nomination, and Judge Duval having resigned, President Jackson nominated Mr. Taney as Associate-Judge of the Supreme Court. The Senate rejected this nomination also. But Old Hickory bided his time, and when Chief Justice Marshall died in 1835, he again sent in Taney's name. By this time the complexion of the Senate had changed, and the Administration party had a majority. Taney was repaid for his rejections by being made Chief Justice, and he held this position for twenty-seven years.

Coming into office in this way he could not be popular with the Whigs, and his unpopularity was added to by his decision as to Dred Scott. The Senate demurred as to the placing of his bust in the Supreme Court room, and though his judicial in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tegrity had never been impeached, and though he was a fine lawyer, he will not, on account of these things, ever receive the credit to which he is entitled.

Salmon P. Chase, who succeeded Taney, was, perhaps, the finest looking of the Chief Justices. Tall, well formed and majestic, he had a great dome of a head, a high, broad, forehead, and bright, sparkling eyes. His first visit to Washington was to seek a place in the departments, and he applied to his uncle, who was then in the Senate, to secure him an appointment. The old Senator, who understood a great deal more about Washington departments than his nephew, promptly refused, and said :

"My boy, I will give you a half-dollar to buy a spade and you may dig your way into something of a place in life, but I will not get you a place in a Government office. I have already ruined one or two young men in that way, and am not going to ruin you. The man who enters the Government service seldom does anything more. He is swallowed up in these departments, and that is the last heard of him."

Chase then opened a private school at Washington, but I do not think he made much out of it. While he was teaching school he studied law under William Wirt, and when he was first examined for the bar he answered so poorly that he was told he had better read for another year. He replied that he could not do that, as he had made all his arrangements to begin the practice of law at Cincinnati. When the judges found that he was going to practice at Cincinnati, they told the clerk to swear him in, as any law would do for Cincinnati.

Young Chase's first fee was a half-dollar for drawing up a paper for a client, and it is said that this same client came in the next day and borrowed the half-dollar from him! He went on, however, and by espousing the cause of anti-slavery clients he made a reputation, and got a chance to show the great abilities which he really possessed. He became Governor of Ohio, was elected to the United States Senate, was made Secretary of the Treasury, and, on the death of Judge Taney, was offered the Chief Justiceship of the United States. He accepted it, but was not happy in it. The bee of Presidential ambition stung him, and his last days were those of disappointment in that he did not secure the nomination.

He was undoubtedly a man of extraordinary ability, and, still,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much of his success was due to hard work. During his boyhood he gave but little promise of his future, and he had, as had Chief Justice Jay, a bad impediment in his speech. He was stoop-shouldered, shambling and slouchy, and a number of stories are told of him during his school-days in Ohio. His uncle was Bishop Chase, who was in charge of the Episcopal district of Ohio, and who kept a private boarding-school near Columbus. It was here that Salmon P. Chase got his first education. He did the chores about the house and worked on the farm during the vacations. It was here, while he was shambling along the road one day in his awkward way, that he passed two rail-splitters, and these, expecting him to speak to them, stopped their work. Chase was thinking of something very deeply, and he did not look up. As he went by he heard one man say to the other:

"What awkward fool is that?" and the other replied:

"Why, that's the Bishop's nephew, and he has'nt got enough spunk in him to amount to anything!"

This roused the spirit of Chase to its very depths. He determined to improve his personal appearance, and he began at once a systematic gymnastic training. It is said that one day, while he was exercising, he felt something give way in his side. It hurt him at the time, and he fainted away. He continued his gymnastics, however, and he made himself one of the straightest and finest-looking of public men.

The story of young Chase's encounter with a pig is worth retelling. One day his uncle, the Bishop, started out on the circuit, and as he left he told Salmon to stop his studies at noon and kill and dress a pig. The only thing that young Chase knew was that he had first to catch the pig. After great trouble he did this, and succeeded in killing it. And now the question was as to how to get the hair off. He had heard of farmers scalding hogs, and he soused the pig into a barrel of hot water. He either held the pig in too long, or the water was too hot or not hot enough, so that the bristles of the pig were rather tightened than loosened. They stuck as though glued, and would not come off. After scraping and scratching until his fingers were raw, he thought of the Bishop's razors, and, getting them, shaved the pig from nose to tail. When the Bishop came home he congratulated his nephew on the splendid appearance of the pork, but the eating and shaving of the next day told a different story. The roots of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bristles remained in the hog, and the razors were so dull that the Bishop tried in vain to scrape the bristles from his face.

Leaving Ohio for New Hampshire, young Salmon went to school at Dartmouth, and it is said here that he left the college because a friend of his was, he thought, unjustly suspended. The faculty allowed the two boys to go off, but finally concluded that they could not afford to lose two students, and sent a messenger after them.

Chief Justice Chase dressed in black while he was in Washington. He fully appreciated the dignity of the Supreme Court, and he was naturally a dignified man. His private secretary, Mr. Didier, says that he had little appreciation of humor, and rarely indulged in a joke. He was regular in his habits of life, and his tastes were simple. He rose at six o'clock in summer and at seven in winter, and he breakfasted at eight. After his breakfast he read over his letters and dictated answers to them or prepared his opinions. At ten o'clock he left the house to go to the Capitol, and walked when the weather was fair and rode when it was bad. He returned at three, and, after a simple lunch of crackers and tea, he went back to work on his opinions, and continued to work until dinner-time, which was at six o'clock. His table was elegant, and his dinner usually consisted of three courses and a dessert.

His daughter, Miss Kate Chase, was one of the most brilliant women Washington society has ever known; and her entertainments while her father was Chief Justice and Secretary of State were the social events of the National capital.

The story of the appointment of Chief Justice Chase's successor has been recently told in the newspapers. General Grant finally made a good selection in the choice of Chief Justice Waite, and the Chief Justices of the United States have, so far, been an honor to the country. From Jay to Waite they have one and all been able lawyers. They have been men versed in statesmanship and possessed of extraordinary culture. They have been men of minds and hearts as well as just judges, and to the ordinary reader their personal traits will be fully as interesting as the record of their able judicial decisions.

FRANK G. CARPENTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN WOOL INDUSTRY.

THE recent vote in the House of Representatives to put wool on the free list and the probability that this vote will shortly be submitted to the judgment of the American people, make a review of our wool industry especially appropriate at this time.

The American wool clip amounts to about three hundred million pounds per annum. The best private authorities place it higher than this, and it is pretty clear that the Government estimates are too low. But the figures given here are within bounds.

Its annual value varies with the condition of the market from seventy-five to ninety millions of dollars. It stands sixth in value on the list of American agricultural products, and is surpassed only by corn, hay, wheat, cotton and oats. The number of sheep is estimated at fifty millions, worth on an average something over two dollars each, or not less than one hundred million dollars.

If the annual product of mutton for food, and the increase of the flocks in prosperous times were added to the value of the wool, the total amount would exceed $125,000,000.

Sheep husbandry is distributed over the whole country. It is the only great farm industry in the benefits of which every section of the country shares. The distribution of the annual benefits is as follows ;

New England	4	per cent	5,000,000 dollars.
Middle States	9	"	11,000,000 "
Southern States	11	"	14,000,000 "
Western States	37	"	46,000,000 "
Pacific States	18	"	23,000,000 "
Territories	21	"	26,000,000 "
Total	100	"	125,000,000 "

But the annual value of the American wool industry is not limited to the clip of wool or the increase of the flock or its con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribution to our supply of animal food. Its value as a means of enriching the soil is recognized by intelligent farmers, though unfortunately it is not generally appreciated. One of the thriftiest farmers in the State of New York has said that after a careful study of the subject, he believed that the advantage derived yearly from the improved fertility of his land where the sheep were pastured, equaled the value of his wool clip. This element of value has not been investigated carefully enough to justify positive conclusions, though it may not be unreasonable to estimate the annual gain to the country from this source of fertilization at not less than fifty millions of dollars.

The proportion of the value of farm lands which is due to sheep husbandry and to the income derived from it, is important though not easy to determine. Yet, when it is considered that there is no substitute for sheep, and that many of our farms consist largely of land suitable for sheep pastures, and which, without sheep husbandry, would be unused and deteriorate in fertility, it must be admitted that no estimate of the advantages of American sheep husbandry is complete which fails to appreciate the decline in the value of our farm lands which would follow the abandonment of this industry.

It is claimed in a recently published statement that this decline would exceed two dollars and a half per acre on one hundred and twelve million acres, or $280,000,000.

The United States is the second wool-producing country in the world. Australia, with its vast area of unoccupied land, is the first. South America ranks third, where land and labor rank the lowest in value. Russia is the fourth, with its boundless wastes and semi-slave population. The total production of the world, so far as it comes within the field of statistics, amounts to about two thousand millions of pounds, of which this country furnishes one-sixth part. This important proportion must be considered in estimating the effect of legislation tending to discourage our sheep husbandry. A serious reduction of the American clip, coincident with a constant increase in the world's consumption of wool, could not fail to be quickly followed by an advance in the price of foreign wools, with higher profits for foreign wool-growers, and increased cost of woolen goods.

It is a fact which at once arrests attention—when known—that the United States is the only civilized country in which there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has, in recent years, been a large increase in the production of wool. None of the European counties show a flourishing condition of sheep husbandry. All of them show a great decline in their wool production since 1870, and are large importers of the wool required for their manufactures. France produces less than a hundred million pounds, and imports more than three hundred millions. England uses less than a hundred million pounds of her own wool and imports more than two hundred millions. The United States, on the other hand, has increased its wool product from sixty million pounds in 1860 to more than three hundred millions in 1884, and supplies eighty per cent. of the wool required for its manufactures. The Australian clip during the same time, under the greatest advantages of soil and climate —with cheap land and cheap labor—has advanced from fifty million to four hundred and fifty million pounds. The production of all Europe is not now materially greater than it was in 1850, although it increased steadily down to the year 1870. Since then, under the competition of Australian and South American wools, the European wool product has declined twenty-five per cent. and stands nearly where it did forty years ago. During this same period the world's production of wool has more than doubled. It has increased three times as fast as population, and prices have declined in a similar ratio. Mulhall gives the following table of prices and consumption of wool in England :

Year.	Price.	Pounds consumed.
1850	23d.	158,000,000
1860	20d.	224,000,000
1870	15d.	309,000,000
1883	12d.	328,000,000

It is interesting to note the comparatively small increase of consumption in England since 1870—only 9 per cent. in thirteen years ; just keeping pace with her growth in population during that time.

The United States in ten years, 1870 to 1880, increased its consumption of wool 70 per cent., while her population increased about 30 per cent. Meantime the prices of wool have remained, under the influence of our protective policy, comparitively uniform, varying in the New York market as follows : For medium wool, 1850, 40 cts.; 1860, 45 cts.; 1870, 48 cts.; 1883,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

40 cts. The American farmers have received remunerative prices for wool and the American manufacturers have extended their consumption of wool 70 per cent., while in England prices of wool have declined nearly 50 per cent. and the consumption of wool in manufactures has not, in proportion to population, increased at all.

Whatever may be the decision of the American people as to the advantage of maintaining the wool tariff, it cannot be doubted, upon a review of the facts already stated, that the wool tariff has, during the past twenty-five years, prevented the decline of our wool industry, and secured its rapid extension, together with the equally rapid growth of our wool manufactures. And there can be no doubt that in the absence of adequate protection, the experience of this nation, as respects its wool-production, would have been the same as that of all other civilized nations, where the wool industry has made no progress, or has declined because, with even cheaper labor than ours, they have not been able to compete with the product of new and semi-barbarous countries.

No more comple demonstration of the necessity of protection to maintain and advance the American wool industry can be offered than this contrast between the development of the industry here and its decline in Europe under the same exterior influences. A comparison of the average prices of wool here and in Europe confirms this demonstration. For, excluding temporary and local effects, the prices of our wools as compared with prices of corresponding qualities in Europe, have uniformly been determined on the average by the rates of duty. An interesting statement of the relative prices of domestic and foreign wools of similar qualities was issued last December by Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co., wool merchants, of Philadelphia. The details would take too much space here, but they show clearly that however low the prices of our wools may at times have appeared to American farmers, they were still substantially well up to the duty line—*i. e.*, the foreign value with the duty added.

And this fact suggests another view of the relation of protection to our wool industry. It is an axiom of the protective doctrine that home competition, under adequate protection, will insure lower prices; and it is believed that not a single case can be adduced of an article, the production of which has been developed by protection, that has not declined in price below the foreign price with the duty added.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This result has been achieved in all our leading industries. In some cases the American product has been reduced in price to less than the duty on the corresponding foreign article. This is true of a great variety of woolen fabrics, especially those used by the working people, and it accounts in part for the fact, often stated and often denied, that many kinds of ordinary clothing are as cheap here as in England.

The operation of the rule that protection secures lower prices has, in regard to wool, been obstructed by the extraordinary development of our wool manufactures and the demand for wool, which have increased in the same ratio as our wool production. The census figures are as follows:

	Wool clip.	Wool manufactures.
1859	60,000,000 lbs.	$65,000,000
1879	232,000,000 lbs.	267,000,000

But the effect of the duties has been sufficiently marked to justify the continued application of protection to our wool industry for the *distinct and avowed purpose to secure lower prices.* No reason can be given why the wool industry is exceptional, or why under the law of competition wool would not be reduced in price as other protected products have been, by the persistent application of skill and intelligence, without impairing the prosperity of the industry. The decline in foreign prices has already caused a reduction of the cost of producing here, through an increase of the weight of the fleece. Before 1860 the average weight was less than three pounds. In 1870 it was three and a half pounds. In 1880 it was six pounds. In Great Britain in 1880 it was four pounds.

An immediate reduction of price would be secured by the swifter process recommended by the President and embodied in the Mills bill. But this course would find our wool growers unable to compete with their Australian and South American rivals and would destroy a most valuable national industry.

Adequate and persistent protection would, on the other hand, increase our production, and gradually bring about lower prices. The law of competition would intervene. Cheaper methods would yield their fruits to skillful research. Those parts of the country best adapted to sheep husbandry would be devoted especially to it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and those least adapted would be given up to other uses. Our Northern farmers would develop the value of their sheep for food and for fertilizing the land. The Southern farmers would find in sheep husbandry a hitherto comparatively unexplored means for increasing their incomes and improving their lands.

Thus encouraged, it is not easy to conceive of any limit to the wool product of the United States, nor to fix a limit to the decline in price which would be reached when the industry had been thoroughly developed in those vast and now sparsely settled portions of the country where climate and soil are favorable, and where sheep can be pastured all through the year with little or no expense for food or care.

Adversely to these views, it has of late been alleged by Mr. Mills and others that the tariff on wool has not proved advantageous, and that we are farther to-day than ever from supplying the home demand. The following table, compiled from the U. S. Bureau of Statistics, completely refutes the allegation, and proves that this country can, under the present tariff system, produce the wool required for its manufactures, and manufacture the woolen goods required for its people.

It also demonstrates beyond question the powerful influence of our protective policy on the development of our wool and woolen industries, and indicates clearly the disasters which would follow the overthrow of this policy.

It will be observed that the quantity of American woolens used by our people has increased from two dollars and eleven cents per capita in 1859 to five dollars and thirty-four cents in 1879. It will be noted that the quantity of foreign woolens used by our people has decreased from one dollar and thirty-five cents per capita in 1859 to seventy cents in 1879.

In other words we use three times as many American woolens per capita as we did a quarter of a century ago, and only about half as many foreign woolens. It will also be seen that the average product of American wool has doubled in about ten years, and the product per capita has increased twenty-five per cent. On the other hand the importation of foreign wools, such as is produced in the United States, has actually diminished in volume ten per cent., and, per capita of population 40 per cent. It is evident that American wool is gradually taking the place of foreign wools in American manufactures, and that our wool produc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INCREASE OF THE AMERICAN WOOL CLIP AND WOOL MANUFACTURES, CONTRASTED WITH IMPORTS OF FOREIGN WOOLENS.

	American wool clip, lbs.	Production per capita of population, lbs.	American wool manufactures.	Value per capita of population.	Imports of woolen goods.	Imports per capita of population.	Ratio of imports to total consumption of woolen goods.
1859....	60,000,000	$1\frac{3}{10}$	$65,596,000	$2.11	$42,832,000	$1.35	40 per cent.
1869....	162,000,000	$4\frac{35}{100}$	172,495,000	4.66	36,676,000	.96	17 per cent.
1879....	232,000,000	$4\frac{3}{10}$	267,252,000	5.34	35,013,000	.70	12 per cent.

THE AMERICAN WOOL CLIP COMPARED WITH IMPORTS OF FOREIGN WOOLS

Ten years.	Average American clip, lbs.	Production per capita, lbs.	Average annual imports, clothing and combing high duty wools, lbs.	Imports per capita, lbs.	Average annual imports low duty carpet wools, lbs.	Imports per capita, lbs.
1867-76...	172,000,000	$4\frac{3}{10}$	22,400,000	$\frac{56}{100}$	28,900,000	$\frac{72}{100}$
Five years 1882-86...	297,000,000	$5\frac{5}{10}$	19,600,000	$\frac{36}{100}$	56,000,000	$1\frac{4}{100}$

tion has more than kept pace with the increase of the home demand.

The only gain in the wool imports, raw or manufactured, has been in carpet wools, many kinds of which we cannot produce here, and all of which we are discouraged by the low duties from trying to produce. These increasing imports of low duty wools, contrasted with the decreasing imports of high duty wools, indicate plainly the consequences of the President's scheme of free wool, should it ever be realized. That independence of foreign nations, which was the motive of our fathers in founding the protective system, would be lost, and the nation would become dependent upon foreign countries for one of its most essential necessaries of life.

The defenders of the President's free wool policy, for want of solid arguments, have resorted to misleading statements. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assertion of Mr. Mills that we use six hundred million pounds of wool in our woolen manufactures, and after twenty-five years of protection produce only half that quantity, already been shown to be untrue. To make up the six hundred million pounds Mr. Mills includes all the foreign wool used in foreign countries to make the woolen goods imported to the United States. The plain truth is that our wool growers have kept pace with the home demand, and only ask for a greater demand that they may have an *opportunity to increase their flocks.*

While the majority of one branch of the national legislature has been assailing our wool industry, the Department of State, unwilling not to do its share in support of the President's policy, has been employing the American Consul at Tunstall, England, to prepare a series of reports, in which, by bewildering figures and limping logic he seeks to show that the labor cost of American woolen manufactures is lower than the foreign labor cost of similar fabrics. It is understood that this was the motive for his appointment.

The results, evidently prepared for the emergency, have been suddenly spread before the people, in special issues of consular reports, just upon the eve of popular discussion of the subject. Their argument is that with free raw material no protection is required for American manufactures, thus aiming to sweep away the entire system of protection. To refute it, we have the fact that in spite of a duty of forty per cent., we import more than thirty millions worth of cotton goods, and in spite of a duty of fifty per cent., we import more than thirty millions worth of silk goods—although both cotton and silk are free of duty, and our appliances for manufacture nowhere surpassed.

And we have the further fact that with a compensating duty for the duty on wool allowed to our manufacturers, and a duty of from thirty-five to fifty per cent. to cover the difference in labor cost, there are still imported more than forty millions worth of woolen goods.

The consul, selected by the Department of State, for this inglorious work of undermining the industries of the United States, it is pleasing to note, is not an American. Though presuming to dispute the statements of more than nine-tenths of our wool manufacturers respecting their own business, he has himself had no experience in wool manufactures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is true that he assumed the rôle of a wool manufacturer before the Tariff Commission in 1882, and then proffered his advice. But when asked what kind of woolen goods he manufactured, he admitted that he was only a skirt maker, and was allowed to withdraw.

It is almost incredible that a great political party, including many patriotic citizens, and led by the President, should be thus intent upon the overthrow of one of our most important national industries.

It can be explained only upon the old Roman theory, "Whom the gods mean to destroy they first make mad."

E. H. AMMIDOWN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY QUESTION.

THE question of adequately, not to say generously and handsomely, providing to make the Congressional Library at Washington our greatest American library, and ultimately one of the greatest in the world, does not seem to be understood at Washington. A clause in the Civil Appropriations bill has been adopted by the House, which contemplates another question entirely, and takes no thought for anything more than a Library of Congress supplied with such works as the members of Congress might wish to consult.

It is proposed to enact that plans and estimates shall be secured for a library building which shall not cost more than $3,000,000; and the purpose is said to be to devote this building to a mere reference library for the use of Congress, or at least to a library restricted within the limits of the proposed structure. Some members of Congress are even reported as desiring no new library at all, but a distribution of much of the present collection and a mere library for reference in the building now in use.

In either case the plan lets go a great opportunity, for the improvement of which people of all parties, and sects, and interests, ought to be heartily united. It sets aside, also, a plan already under way and much advanced, for erecting a building such as a national library needs, according to a bill passed two years since, and for some time in process of being carried out as fast as circumstances permit. A fine site, and the beginning of a proper building, are handed over under the new proposal to the Interior Department as relics of an abortive attempt to make wise provision for a great Congressional Library.

It would be difficult for Congress to judge more wrongly than in this scheme of the national interest and honor. America, richer than any other land in the diffusion of culture, in small public and private libraries and in books everywhere intelligently read, is yet poorer than any other country of the first rank in great libraries, and the Congressional Library of the United States is our one chance to make an American library on a scale representative of our place in the history of human culture. It has now something more than 400,000 volumes, and on the fingers of one hand we can count the other American libraries which go beyond about 200,000 volumes: the public library in Boston, which the city of Boston alone will make our greatest library, if the nation is too stingy to keep up the Congressional: the Harvard Library at Cambridge, which is well on beyond a quarter of a million, and the Astor and Mercantile in New York, which have gone considerably beyond 200,000.

What are these compared with the 3,390,000 volumes collected in the fifteen libraries of Paris, 2,290,000 of them in the B. Nationale alone; the 1,500,000 of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the British Museum, with many other libraries raising the London total to about 3,200,000 ; the more than 1,200,000 collected in about a dozen libraries at Rome; the 1,000,000 volumes which even Russian St. Petersburg has gathered ; the 1,000,000 of Munich ; the 750,000 of Berlin, besides the 200,000 of the university, and over 200,000 more in smaller libraries : or even the half million each of Darmstadt, Leipsic, Strasburg, Copenhagen, and Edinburgh (in two collections) ; and the 400,000 or more at each of such places as Madrid, Florence, Vienna, and Oxford, in the Bodleian, besides as many more in a score of lesser libraries. If the cost should reach $10,000,000 within as many years, Congress can yet do nothing wiser than to ungrudgingly provide both a suitable place for a great national library, and ample means for developing it on a scale commensurate with American interest in literature and American creation of literature. It is a splendid distinction, a national monument, which the United States can afford, and ought on every ground to afford now, lest history point the finger of scorn to legislators who rooted up a foundation the wisest ever planted on our soil.

EDWARD C. TOWNE.

II.

THE ESSENTIAL EDUCATIONAL REFORM.

EDUCATIONAL reform has occasioned a deal of clean brain-work lately through both the magazine and book press. Woman's emancipation clamor, technical training courses, public school methods, science versus classics in university training, etc., have led to solemn incubation and no little cackle over the egg. The result of the hatching, though, has been of little moment compared with the importance of one phase of the problem of reform totally slighted. This has nothing to do with pedagogue or lecture room, or, indeed, with intellectualism in any sense. It touches the moral side of life, the *esse*, not the *posse*, and sinks to the very tap-root of training. It begins with the drying up of the mother's milk, and, precious as that mother's milk, feeds the life-springs of a healthy life. This training is the cultivation of the habit of naked, unshrinking veracity, the die-sinking of the impression so deep as to be ineradicable, that to lie is to incur disgrace of the blackest possible stain. Perhaps most parents teach the evils of mendacity and punish it. But the discipline is too shallow and feeble for any subsoiling, and the child escapes to playground and schoolroom ripe for the thistle seeds.

The ancient Persian, in the day when he was hero and conqueror, summed up the education of youth in the triple teaching, to speak the truth, to be fearless, and to be a skillful archer. In one sense only do we moderns honor the example, and then only metaphorically. We are adepts in drawing the long-bow. Cut many of the fairest fruits of civilization open, and you will find the lie coiled like a worm at the core. Sometimes, indeed, it has helped the mellowing, for deceit has a function in some of the glittering and attractive sides of culture. The so-called amenities of life cling to the lie as a convenient lubricant. Grinding competition in all lines of trade and commerce tempts the constant manipulation of the lie in some of its forms. The lie of the lawyer is almost a necessity of professional ethics. The harness of the politician and diplomat would gall most grievously without this padding. The journalist, when need be, lies, because he finds his vocation and profit in amusing the public fond of extravagant and sensational stories. The man of society—but why multiply examples? Of course the self-respecting liar sugar-coats the fact with euphemism, and is prompt to resent the charge. Disgrace consists not in the lie, but in the exposure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Naked veracity is the most unfashionable of virtues. Generally the liar and the coward are bound together in the self-same calfskin. If courage exists, it is more apt to be the lower form of physical courage. The habit of truth is always conjoined with moral courage, even if not always concomitant with fighting "grit." In any case it raises natural courage to its nth power, be it great or small. The redeeming feature of the English public schools, brutal as they are, is that a liar is instantly tabooed and exiled by his mates. So at West Point, the cadet caught in a lie is promptly and permanently cut by his class. Truth and courage are thus recognized as Siamese twins, each necessary to the other. Montaigne recognized this in his celebrated definition of the lie as courage toward God, and cowardice toward man.

Untruthfulness with its sequence of moral cowardice is the most prolific source of the corruption of the age. It should be strangled where Hercules strangled the serpents, in the cradle. Trained at home to love truth with a passionate reverence, the child blossoming into youth and manhood consecrates the idol on a shrine in the *penetralia* of his being. In the beautiful words of Sir Henry Wotton:

> "This man is freed from servile bands
> Of hopes to rise or fears to fall;
> Lord of himself, if not of lands,
> And having nothing, yet hath all."

There is hardly a social or a public evil that would not shrivel to its minimum before this sun-like force. Why such hair-splitting over the niceties of intellectual training, with the infinitely more important need crying to us? Train the child, all children up to manhood, to be unflinching truth-tellers. Then will the *pou sto* have been found, and the millennium be near at hand. Truth-tellers are instinctively truth-seekers. Intellectual education will be quickened to ends undreamed of now. Mephistophiles, the Goethean demon, who is the spirit of dissent, denial, skepticism, the deification of the sneer, belongs to the small fry of hell beside his great Suzerain, the Father of Lies.

G. T. FERRIS

III.

THE DECLINE OF THE THOROUGHBRED.

THE only real argument for the existence of horse racing, and the raising of thoroughbred racehorses, is the improvement of the breed of horses. Thoughtful men, however, are gradually becoming convinced that horse racing, as it at present exists on both sides of the Atlantic, is really tending towards a deterioration in horse flesh. The importance of this fact, if true, cannot be overestimated, for, once admitted, horse racing is without a *raison d'être*. The thoroughbred of to-day is produced with the sole object of furnishing an animal which will procure a liberal reward for its breeder and owner at the earliest possible moment. According to the short-sighted notions of most owners, two and three-year-old racing affords this immediate return. Consequently, it receives the lion's share of attention, while the racing of maturer animals is comparatively neglected. It seems almost unnecessary to demonstrate the patent folly of this, and certainly no sane racing man can assert that running youngsters before their frame and bones have settled is calculated to improve the breed of horses. High prices are paid only for racing stock which is descended from the most celebrated winners. Size, shape, bone, muscle, and stamina are elements which are very little considered. The effect of this is seen in the rapid decadence of the English and American draught

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horse. Firstrate animals of this kind must now be imported from France, where proper attention is given to their breeding, and the prices they command are gradually becoming so large as to put them out of reach of the ordinary buyer of limited means. The racehorse shows but one pace—the gallop; the walk and trot are never thought of in breeding this animal, and the sire and dam are selected with the sole view of increasing the "gallop stride," and with it the breeder's exchequer. If a tithe of the money expended upon breeding two-year old and other immature racers, could be directed in the channel of the horse for draught purposes, we could now supply our own demand for good cartage horses, and the nation's prosperity would be thus correspondingly increased. Handsome rewards for the general utility horse at horse shows would go much further toward improving the breed than the combined riches of our two and three-year-old stakes. The blooded horse of former days was very valuable in improving coarser breeds of horses, because a fully developed five-year-old was more of an ideal than a two-year-old forced by hot-house methods into an unnatural maturity, full of the seeds of early decay. The late Admiral Rous demanded heavy purses for five-year-olds and upward as a remedy for this evil. He was undoubtedly right in thinking that this would alone induce owners to show more mercy to young horses. Larger stakes for longer distances would likewise tend to preserve the most valuable qualities of the thoroughbred. Some step in this direction is imperative. To a genuine lover of horses it is heart-rending to see a noble thoroughbred on the race-track, crippled by having been unduly forced at an early age. It may be said of them as the Spanish proverb has it, "El corazon manda las carnes"—"the heart bears up the body." But courage alone will not serve for breeding.

Contained in a weak frame it will not pull a heavy load.

CLARENCE LEVEY.

IV.

THE HOME AND FOREIGN MARKETS.

PROTECTIONISTS, by their policy, seek to secure the home market for the home worker. Free traders, by their policy, seek to put foreigners on the same footing in our markets as native workers, leaving to the native American the entire expense of government. They insist that the policy of protection prevents us from competing in the markets of the world—that it is better to secure a share of the trade of the 800 millions outside of the United States, than a monopoly of the trade of the 60 millions inside of our boundaries. But this is a fallacy. All Asia, with her countless hosts of semi-naked and penniless inhabitants, will not compensate us for the loss of the trade of a single American manufacture in a single American State. Besides, the markets of the world are already occupied, and even England finds it impossible, with all her wealth and resources and experience, to hold her own in most of them. Germany is pressing her hard everywhere, and is rapidly driving her out of South America. Against the cheap labor, industrial skill and limitless resources of Europe, how could we ever hope to make a successful struggle for the foreign market anywhere? The hope is the offspring of ignorance or craft. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush—especially if the bush is thousands of miles away, and one has neither gun nor stone, nor any greater skill than the owners of the industrial Gatling guns within easy range of the bush.

Besides American statistics show that a protective tariff, instead of interfering with our foreign trade, encourages it. In the last ten years of a low tariff—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 1850 to 1860—the excess of our imports over our exports was over 364 millions of dollars. During the last ten years of a protective tariff, the excess of exports over imports was $11,345,860. The tariff was reduced in 1883. Our foreign trade that year amounted to $1,547,020,043. In 1886 the returns show a falling off amounting to $232,059,350. Since the defeat of the Morrison bill our foreign trade has been rapidly increasing.

During the ten years of a low tariff there was only one year in which our exports exceeded our imports, whereas there has not been a single year of the eleven years of a high tariff in which our exports were not greater than our imports.

During that period our exports have exeeded our imports to the enormous amount of $1,710,544,903. Seventy-five per cent. of our exports were agricultural products, and our farming industries, therefore, were the gainers to that amount by the policy of protection, which English manufacturers and their echoers, the American free traders, are so anxious to abolish for the "poor" and "struggling" American farmer.

JOHN BALL, JR.

V.

HOW TO NAME CHILDREN.

I TURNED the leaves of the May REVIEW until I came to "Notes and Comments," when I read No. 1, by P. J. Otey, "How to Name Children," in which he reasons half seriously that it is dangerous to give children more than one name.

Now this needs no reply, by reason of any logical value which the article may be thought to have, but it is another illustration of the folly of reasoning from numbers taken at random and applied to everything from the tariff down to the naming of our children.

People love to draw conclusions from statistics, and very few of them ever stop to inquire how often the same fact is followed by the same effect.

Let us now apply Mr. Otey's discoveries to another set of names in another age and witness the result.

The Comptroller's report for Tennessee, made in 1887, shows that there were ninety-five county trustees, and all of them, except nine, had more than one name, or what we usually call a double name.

The report shows that rewards were offered and paid for forty-six fugitives from justice, and that only three had more than one name, and that of the forty persons who received the rewards thirty-seven had more than one name.

I do not, therefore, believe that plain John has, so far as name is concerned, any advantage over James G. in a race for the presidency.

It is not true that figures never lie; they lie outrageously. Abstract numbers mean nothing, tariff debaters to the contrary notwithstanding.

J. D. TILLMAN.

VI.

A REPLY TO MR. BROMLEY.

MR. ISAAC H. BROMLEY, in the July number of this REVIEW, criticises my article on "Dangerous Trusts" in the May number, mainly because, as he alleges, my language is too strong and exaggerated. He also intimates that I obtained my facts from the newspapers, et cætera, and that there is nothing in the history and investigations of the Pacific railroads that would justify a careful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writer in designating the constructors and managers of those great national highways as robbers and plunderers of the United States Treasury. The so-called "trusts" which continue to spring into existence, to prey upon "the fat of the land" all over the country, he does not directly appear to condemn or defend; but his sole purpose seems to be to defend the gentlemen connected with the Pacific railroads. He does this in an attractive manner, by entertaining the readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW with a liberal supply of anecdotes and jokes not altogether the newest. It seems to me that this is trifling with one of the most serious questions, and the one great question in which the people are all practically interested, and severely in earnest. I am not one of those who believe that "all property is robbery," nor that corporations should be made the scapegoats of "loose denunciation." On the contrary, I maintain that corporations have played leading parts—the star parts—on the great stage of our country's development and progress. Let justice be done them. Nevertheless it may be said, with "reverential calm," that about nineteen out of every twenty of the adult population of this country firmly believe that there has been improper speculation, fraudulent dealing, and in a large, general and universal sense, wholesale robbery in the construction and management of the Pacific railroads. I think the evidence sustains this. This universal sentiment and belief among all classes of our people is not wrong. "*Vox populi vox Dei.*" Historically, the universal voice of a people has always, in its principal stream, been distinctly an evolution of truth and a reliable standard of justice. And I am glad to be reassured that "Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and several other States" have begun to control the corporations in their several jurisdictions, and I hope the time may soon come when we shall be able to do the same here in Pennsylvania. Whenever the people's trusts are being violated and abused by those to whom they have been delegated, whether they be legislatures, judges, executives or corporations, the most effective weapons to arouse the people are by "glowing periods," "tingling denunciations" and "lurid rhetoric." These have ever been the weapons of revolution, without arms and without bloodshed, and Mr. Bromley has no just cause to complain so bitterly because Professor Swing and myself have tried to invoke them in a good cause. It is to be regretted that Mr. Bromley did not confine himself to the questions at issue, *ex animo*, and if not to the issue, then much worth reading could have been said in favor of corporations generally, even if he had been obliged to exclude the Pacific railroads from his article as he did the "Trusts."

W. M. RAPSHER.

VII.

SIBERIA AND "GEORGEISM."

IN the July number, Mr. G. T. Ferris calls attention to the following extract from George Kennan's "Siberian" article, said extract, in Mr. Ferris' opinion, showing the *practical workings* of Mr. Henry George's single tax upon relative land values:

"With a few exceptions all of the land in Siberia belongs to the crown. The village communes enjoy the usufruct of it, but they have no legal title, and cannot dispose of it nor reduce any part of it to individual ownership. All they have the power to do is to divide it up among their members by periodical allotments, and to give to each head of a family a sort of tenancy at will. Every time there is a new allotment the several tracts of arable land held by the crown may change tenants. So that if an individual should build a house or a barn upon the tract of which he was the temporary occupant, he might, and probably would, be forced, sooner or later, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abandon it. The result of this system of land tenure and this organization of society is to segregate the whole population in villages, and to leave all of the intervening land unsettled."

Either Mr. Ferris does not fully understand the "George Theory" or he failed to notice that in the above extract from Mr. Kennan there is lacking one of the essential elements of Mr. George's plan, *i. e.*, the occupant of land shall retain undisturbed possession, so long as he complies with the conditions prescribed by the law in the case. Under such conditions as Mr. Kennan notices, no one would care to improve property; under the George theory improvements would be encouraged.

EDWARD QUINCY NORTON.

VIII.

THE DEATH INSTINCT IN ANIMALS.

IN a recent number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW the question is suggested whether animals are subject to premonitions of death.

Years ago I was staying at a farm-house where it was the custom every evening to drive a small herd of cows from the pasture to a lot near the barn. It was decided one day to kill one of the number, a yearling, whose mother also belonged to the herd. The calf was accordingly left in the lot, while the rest were driven as usual to the pasture. No sooner had the butcher slain his victim than there could be distinctly heard from the pasture, half a mile away, the mournful lowing of the mother, the other cows occasionally joining in what could be described only as a wail. The circumstance interested me very much, and I walked over to the pasture. Through thirty years that pathetic picture of maternal grief has remained with me! It seemed to me that there was the actual sobbing of a bursting heart, and to my childish eyes there were tears moistening the face of the poor, gentle, sorrowful creature before me.

Years afterward my children had a pet cat which it was discovered had now and then violent convulsions. We asked a young lad to shoot her. I went with him into the garden where Puss lay on the grass in the sunshine; the lad walked behind me with a parlor rifle. She was always gentle and rarely shunned any one, but so soon as she saw me she stretched herself backward with a most unearthly cry and looked straight into the mouth of the weapon which ended her life.

We owned also a magnificent St. Bernard dog which became in time a wonder to many in the way of what I must call mental development. He was accustomed, summer and winter, to come into the sitting-room after tea and lie for a while on a rug under the gaslight. At a given signal he would retire at once to the back yard. One night, however, he was reluctant to go—reluctant even to resistance. I coaxed, then forced him, and went to the door with him. He stood outside in a hesitating way, and as I closed the door turned and looked me full in the face with an intense expression of mingled reproach and affection which communicated to me an inexplicable sense of foreboding ill, and the remembrance of which still brings a pang to my heart. When the door closed I heard him leap over the low front gate, and we never saw him again. Some boys out hunting on the following day became frightened at meeting him in the woods, and shot him.

L. H. CRAIG.

IX.

THE TRACKS OF A GOD.

TWO travelers in Asia, as the story is related, lost the camel which they used for carrying burdens. Meeting a native they inquired if he had seen a stray camel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that day. He replied that he had not, but asked them: "Was your camel lame in the left leg behind?" "She was," replied the travelers. "Did she have one tooth out in front?" continued the native. "She had," was the prompt response. "Was she loaded on the left side with honey?" "She was." "And on the right side with bread?" "That is our camel," said the travelers, "tell us where she is." "I know not," said the native, "nor have I any information from any one concerning her, but that camel was in the road a short distance below here to-day."

The travelers believing it impossible for any man to have such accurate knowledge of what he had not seen, procured his arrest on the charge of theft. And on his trial the Arab offered in his defense this explanation: "I knew a camel had been there that day, because I saw fresh tracks of a camel crossing the road; and that it must have been lame in its left leg behind, for it made only a slight impression in the sand with that foot; that it was minus a tooth in front, for I saw where it had picked grass by the roadside, and a blade or two were left standing in the midst of each bite taken; that it was loaded on the left side with honey, for I could see the bees swarming among the leaves of the bushes on that side of the road where it had passed; and that it was loaded on the right side with bread, for there were the little busy ants carrying away the crumbs on that side of its way."

The Arab was acquitted, and the Court, in giving his opinion, observed, that "the wise, by exercising the power of reason which they have, are often accredited by many with possessing knowledge which belongs to none."

The Arab knew that a camel had crossed the road, because nothing but a camel could have made the track which he saw in the sand, and the induction is equally plain and easy, from nature to a God.

Because God is past finding out, and his origin inexplicable, is not sufficient to cover the deceit of those who boldly pretend to discard even the knowledge which they have, and which meets their vision wherever they turn their eyes, whether to things small or great.

He cannot deny the God which the sun in his rising and setting discloses, because he argues with plausibility that the Jehovah of Mount Horeb is a myth.

He may indulge, if he pleases, the task to persuade that immortality is no more than a hope, but he reveals his own insincerity when he asserts that no greater being than man exists.

He may fancy that water in the sun will generate a tadpole, and raise up man through the various stages of existence, but he cannot account for the plan of procreation among animals, nor for the bringing forth fruit after its kind in the vegetable kingdom. In that grand work he sees the great I Am who has been acknowledged and reverenced by all ages.

It is possible for him to denounce Christ as an impostor, and his religion as a fiction; but he cannot meditate upon the rolling of the planets and the innumerable heavenly bodies, the going and return of the seasons, night and day, the winds, rain and sunshine in due season, and the whole as having continued without interruption for ages upon ages, without feeling, stifle it as he may, that there is a creator who lives and is eternal.

T. C. SENSABAUGH.

X.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

IT is noteworthy that the most populous and richest, and possibly the wickedest, State in the Union is the first to inaugurate a scientific method in the execu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the death sentence. The hangman's rope is but a clumsy device even in expert hands, and never a year passed that does not chronicle several instances where the bungling of inexperienced deputies does not shock the sensibilities, not only of spectators, but of the public at large. Even when the fatal noose is properly adjusted death rarely comes on the instant. Originally, of course, public executions were intended to inspire fear in the hearts of possible criminals, but if they ever had this effect it has long since been lost. The conditions have changed. A sensational press delights in printing long and highly-colored accounts of the scene on the scaffold. And on a Friday afternoon or Saturday morning the newsboys in the great cities work off extra editions with the revolting cry, "All about the execution!" Of course the manner is more objectionable than the method, but the public execution is so firmly established that without changing the one it was difficult to change the other. No doubt there are persons who object for one reason or another to the new law which prescribes electricity as the means of execution for capital offenses, but it is difficult to understand why, if criminals are to be executed at all, they should not be put out of the way in the speediest, most certain and least revolting manner known to science. The rope and the garrote maim and distort, the guillotine and the bullet shed blood, but the electric spark extinguishes life instantly, with absolute certainty, and without disfiguration. A competent electrician must make the necessary adjustments. When these have been satisfactorily tested the sheriff or his deputy has only to touch a button and the sentence is executed without the awkward intervention of any mechanical appliance. The new law, too, seeks to abolish the publicity of executions and to prevent the condemned criminal from holding daily levees at the door of his cell. It would seem, upon the whole, that the Republican Legislature and the Democratic Governor of the Empire State have in this case laid aside partisan differences and joined in enacting a law that must, upon the whole, prove a wholesome terror to would-be murderers.

GILROY KEATING.

XI.

IT SERVES THEM RIGHT.

THE numerous reports, essays, editorials, and other articles on such subjects as "Our Sea Coast Defenses," the decline of American shipping, the loss of commercial supremacy in Central and South America, and the wickedness of monopolies, arouse the reflection that the American people suffer from these conditions simply because they deserve to suffer. It may fairly be considered that the people of the United States *have it in their power* to remedy any evil under the sun, excepting poverty, and the Anti-Poverty Society proposes to grapple with even that. No American citizen with a grain of patriotism will ever be likely to admit that, with a proper time allowance, there is something we positively cannot do, provided we have the will. It is our habit to find a way, or make one.

If it is true, as even our rivals are obliged to admit, that we are fertile in resources, phenomenally ingenious, enterprising and aggressive in all the arts of peace, who is to blame for the existence of such evils as those mentioned above? Simply the people who are most affected by them; and if they permit such conditions to go unchanged, do not the resultant losses merely serve them right?

We know too well who caused the decline of American shipping; but if the people most directly affected by it are so indifferent as to let it stay declined, surely the rest of us can stand it if they can. If our surplus of manufacturers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choose to close their factories rather than take the trouble to work up steam communication and a controlling trade with South America, as the English and Germans are doing, let poverty overtake them; it will only serve them right. For years they had it in their power to secure commercial supremacy in the whole of Mexico, Central and South America; but their indifference to the future has cost them a market. If New York goes without adequate defenses until trouble arises with some foreign power having a navy, and its commercial palaces are either knocked into smithereens or ransomed to the tune of a hundred million dollars, will it not serve New Yorkers right for being content to live a single year in such a fool's paradise?

As to that, however, the whole country is equally culpable, and some fine morning when a pair of wicked-looking foreign men-of-war come steaming up the quiet Potomac and give us an option on carting the contents of all the Treasury vaults to the wharf, or having every public building shot full of very large holes, it will serve the tax-payers of the United States just right; and they will not even be entitled to sympathy.

Many people are poor because they deserve to be poor, and it would be wrong for them to be anything else. When we consider that every year about seven hundred million dollars are wasted, aye, worse than wasted in this country in the purchase of intoxicating liquors, and probably as much more is wasted in unproductive time, in fines, tobacco, doctors' bills and other unnecessary luxuries, we need not hesitate to assert that a certain percentage of poverty is unnecessary and therefore deserved.

After all, there are many things "out of joint" in this world simply because we choose to have them so. If we are so engrossed in the pursuit of individual wealth, position and pleasure that we are heedless of to-morrow, when to-morrow comes we must take whatever medicine it brings to our lips, without even the poor pleasure of making a wry face.

W. T. HORNADAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A SPIRITED and original romance by an anonymous author, described on the title page as "A Well-known New Yorker," is the novelette entitled "Napoleon Smith."* The scene is laid in Paris during the last siege, and the point of the story is to furnish an explanation of the fact that in 1876, when specie payments were resumed in this country, there was no paucity of gold. This fact is linked in the story with the scarcity of gold in Europe after the wars of the first Napoleon. The influx of gold into the American Treasury, making resumption possible, is connected with the disappearance of gold from the European treasuries at the beginning of the century. We cannot say that the financial problem is very clearly stated or discussed. Gold had been steadily accumulating in the Treasury for years before resumption, as every one understands. This book suggests a source from which a vast and sudden increase of the precious metal found its way to Uncle Sam's strong box, and around this strange suggestion the author weaves a story of love and adventure which certainly does credit to his powers of imagination. In a note from the publisher we are invited to guess the name of the author, but we must leave this task to others. There are at least a score of "well-known New Yorkers" known to us, any one of whom might have written just such a book as this.

"The Residuary Legatee"† is a charming novellette that will demand two hours' earnest reading from every one who has the fortune to begin its perusal. It has a wholesome air of mystery about it, and will not wear upon the nervous system nor leave the reader entranced and bewildered, nor spoil his night's repose. The hero of the story is a young American, inheritor of a fortune from an uncle, but there is a peculiar condition attached to the will, which for a dozen years keeps our hero and the reader in suspense. The history of those years is told in this book, which can be read in a very short afternoon, and will prove most pleasantly beguiling to any one who desires relief from dull care.

Nora Helen Warddel, in the "Romance of a Quiet Watering Place,"‡ writes in a pretty, off-hand style concerning the doings of a little coterie of friends and other people in a summer vacation at the sea-side. The story is told in a

* "Napoleon Smith." Author, a well-known New Yorker. The Judge Publishing Company.

† "The Residuary Legatee; or, the Posthumous Jest of the Late John Austin." By F. J. Stimson (J. S., of Dale). Charles Scribner's Sons.

‡ "The Romance of a Quiet Watering Place." Being the Unpremeditated Confessions of a not altogether frivolous Girl. Extracted from the private correspondence of Miss Evelyn L. Dwyer. By Nora Helen Warddel. Belford, Clarke & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

series of letters—a plan which gives considerable freedom in the matter of diction, but has the demerit of always suggesting the idea of unreality, since few people, even of the most leisurely sort, write such lengthy epistles in ordinary life as the heroine of this book writes to her bosom friend. There is a touch of grotesqueness, too, in the portraiture of some of the characters, and a decided partiality to foreign noblemen, who seem to be very conveniently at hand when heroic love making is required. The book is sufficiently entertaining for a lazy afternoon, and is aptly illustrated by original pen and ink sketches.

"Hints from a Lawyer"* is the title of a useful little book containing legal information which every one ought to know. It is not an elaborate treatise, nor does it profess to answer complicated questions of law, but it is clearly and concisely written, and deals with points of every-day interest, such as the law of contracts, real estate and chattel mortgages, servants and employers, marriage and divorce, the making of wills, and the estates of deceased persons.

"Summer Legends,"† by the German author, Rudolph Baumbach, translated by Helen B. Dole, form an interesting medley of poetic fancies and fairy tales, which are fitted to wile away indolent half hours or to amuse children.

The experiences of a young lady of society are pleasantly told in a series of confidential letters, presumably written to a sympathetic relative, and collected together under the title of "A Debutante in New York Society."‡ The characters introduced are natural, the people belong, or wish to belong, to the very topmost stratum. There is a worldly-minded and fascinating mamma, a careworn but lovable papa, and a judicious selection of well-bred and agreeable young people, with a few inferior or eccentric persons to give variety. The style of the letters is a little strained, but they afford a glimpse of the aims and doings of people of fashion, and suggest points as to what may be termed the chief end of woman in high life.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Wm. S. Gottsberger.

Leon Roch: A Romance. By B. Perez Galdós. From the Spanish, by Clara Bell. 2 vols.

From Lands of Exile. Pierre Loti. From the French by Clara Bell.

The Story of Jewad. A Romance. By Ali Aziz Efendi. From the Turkish, by E. J. W. Gibb.

Chautauqua Press.

How to Judge of a Picture. John C. Van Dyke.

A. Lovell & Co.

Civics for Young Americans; or, First Lessons in Government. Wm. F. Giffin, A.M.

Cassel & Co.

No. 19 State Street. David Graham Adee.

* "Hints from a Lawyer; or, Legal Advice to Men and Women." By Edgar A. Spencer, of the New York Bar. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

† "Summer Legends." By Rudolph Baumbach. T. Y. Crowell & Co.

‡ "A Debutante in New York Society: Her Illusions, and What Became of Them." By Rachel Buchanan. D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dodd, Mead & Co.

(Works by Walter Besant and James Rice.)
Ready Money Mortiboy: A Matter of Fact Story.
The Chaplain of the Fleet.
The Seamy Side: A Story.

George Routledge & Son.

Thirty Years of Paris. Alphonse Daudet.

T. Y. Crowell & Co.

Power and Liberty. Count Leo Tolstoi. Translated from the French by Huntington Smith.

At Home and in War—1853–1881. Reminiscences and Anecdotes. Alex. Verestchagin. Authorized Translation, by Isabel F. Hapgood.

Taxation in American States and Cities. Richard P. Ely, Ph. D.

D. Appleton & Co.

Eve: A Novel. By S. Baring-Gould.

A Little Maid of Arcadie. Marion C. L. Reeves.

"Books That Have Helped Me." From the *Forum*.

For Fifteen Years: A Sequel to The Steel Hammer. Louis Ulbach.

A Counsel of Perfection. Lucas Malet.

G. P. Putnam's Sons.

In Castle and Cabin; Or Talks in Ireland in 1887. George Pellew, A. M., LL. B.

The Story of Turkey. Stanley Lane Poole. Story of the Nations' Series.
The Gallery of a Random Collector. Clinton Ross.

Bedford, Clarke & Co.

The Romance of a Quiet Watering Place. Nora Helen Warddel.

The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.

Three Introductory Lectures on the Science of Thought. F. Max Müller.

Dawson Brothers, Montreal.

Manual of the Constitutional History of Canada. J. G. Bourinot, LL.D.

Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Black Arrow. A Tale of the War of the Roses. Robert Louis Stevenson.

Woman's Temp. Pub. Association, Chicago.

Our Standard Bearer. Life, Services and Sketches of Gen. Clinton B. Fisk.
The Crusader Series No. 2. Programme for an Entertainment.

Worthington Co.

William Shakespeare Portrayed by Himself. Robert Waters.

Wm. H. Alden, Philadelphia.

The Realities of Heaven. Eight Lectures. Rev. T. F. Wright.

The Judge Publishing Co.

Napoleon Smith. Author, a well-known New Yorker.

Silver, Burdett & Co., Boston.

The Social Influence of Christianity. David J. Hill, LL. D.

Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, New Haven.

Social Struggles. John Philip Phillips.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED